

That incident was in Seattle, Wash., on April 14. I say, quietly but earnestly, that this is an indication of the revolutionary strength which appears at many points in our country; and what the Senator (Mr. BYRD, of West Virginia) has said about the situation in Washington, D.C., is being duplicated, in certain degrees, throughout the country where Senators are holding public hearings and where the conduct of the Federal Government is moving forward through proper and necessary channels.

That tense time may seem to be, in a sense, bizarre. But if Senators are interested in talking to the five Senators who were present, I think they will better understand the tension of the situation, the seriousness of the situation, and of course the revolutionary aspect of the situation in that day's hearing.

It is my conclusion—said with considerable reluctance, but I believe that I should state it because I feel it is necessary—that these people, 10 or 12 who spoke, were not interested in the programs of employment of men and women who are out of work in Seattle or in Washington or in the United States. I hope these people are interested and concerned, as they assert, about the problems of America, and efforts to help men and women. I hope they are. But I have the feeling that they actually desire to overthrow the Government of the United States. Their very statements indicate that belief—in Seattle, in many other parts of the country, in Washington, D.C., throughout the Nation.

It is when we face a situation, as I have described, that we go beyond just the casual or ordinary recognition of isolated problems of disruption and disorder. There must be an awareness on the part of the American people to the fact that this situation does exist. Men and women must be alerted to the danger.

I thank my colleague for permitting me to supplement his statement, and I conclude by emphasizing that there are the inherent rights of dissent and protest and demonstration. We must protect

those rights. But there are also responsibilities for those who plead a cause—be it peace now in Vietnam or other causes they champion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank my senior colleague. He has very appropriately expressed the concern on the part of himself and others of us, and the American people, with respect to some of the problems which, regrettably, increasingly confront the committees of Congress as they go about the country trying to do the work of the people.

#### CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 94, S. 1204. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE). The bill will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1204) to amend section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, to allow certain service to be credited for purposes of civil service retirement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there will be no action on this bill today.

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF UNFINISHED BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of the period for the transaction of routine morning business, the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the program for tomorrow is as follows:

The Senate will convene at 12 o'clock noon. Following the recognition of the two leaders, under the standing order, the following Senators will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes each and in the order stated: MESSRS. BROCK, TAFT, BYRD of Virginia, McGOVERN, PERCY, and HART.

At the conclusion of the remarks of the Senators under the orders for which they will be recognized, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

At the conclusion of the period for the transaction of routine morning business, the Chair will lay before the Senate the then unfinished business, Calendar No. 94, S. 1204, a bill to allow certain service to be credited for purposes of civil service retirement.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1971, at 12 noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4, 1971:

##### FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

The following-named persons to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for terms expiring March 31, 1977:

Ernest G. Spivey, of Mississippi, (reappointment).

Earl S. Smittcamp, of California, vice Paul Arthur Dobson, term expired.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 4, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. R. Herbert Fitzpatrick, First Baptist Church, Riverdale, Md., offered the following prayer:

*If my people, which are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land.—II Chronicles 7: 14.*

Our Heavenly Father, we believe Thy promise and pray that we may meet the conditions of Thy Word, that we may have Thy healing touch for our land. We are in desperate need of Thy blessings and the manifestation of Thy power in our Nation. In this hour when men are so restless, troubled, striving for a solution to the problems that beset us at this time, we look to Thee for direction.

We pray especially for these men and women who have been endowed with such a tremendous responsibility. We

pray that Thou wilt give them the spirit of wisdom and understanding, courage and faith, strength and peace for this troubled hour.

In the name of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the

House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4246. An act to extend until March 31, 1973, certain provisions of law relating to interest rates, mortgage credit controls, and cost-of-living stabilization.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 166. An act to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; and

S. 1260. An act to amend the Small Business Act.

#### RESIGNATION FROM SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a committee:

WASHINGTON, D.C.  
May 1, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,  
The Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This letter is to inform you of the fact that I am tendering my resignation as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business.

It has been a most rewarding experience to have been a member of this Select Committee since it was originally created by resolution which I introduced in 1941.

Unfortunately, because of the press of other duties I feel it would be in the best interest of the Congress to take this action and allow another Member to assume the responsibilities in my place on this most important Committee.

I do not wish to in any way imply that my action in this instance signifies any diminution in my interest in the problems and prospects of small business and wish to assure the Congress and small business throughout the country that I shall continue to maintain my interest in this area and work toward the solution of problems which confront and beset this most vital part of our free enterprise system.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN,  
Chairman.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.  
There was no objection.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 19, 92d Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the permanent Select Committee on Small Business the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. BERGLAND, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

#### PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

#### CLINTON M. HOOSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1824) for the relief of Clinton M. Hoose.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### MRS. ROSE THOMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2067) for the relief of Mrs. Rose Thomas.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2816) for the relief of Rose Minutillo.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### PAUL ANTHONY KELLY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3475) for the relief of Paul Anthony Kelly.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### ESTATE OF CHARLES ZONARS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2127) for the relief of the estate of Charles Zonars, deceased.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

#### MRS. FERNANDE M. ALLEN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5318) for the relief of Mrs. Fernande M. Allen.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### ROBERT F. FRANKLIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5420) for the relief of Robert F. Franklin.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### LEONARD ALFRED BROWNRIGG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1795) for the relief of Leonard Alfred Brownrigg.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### MARIA LUIGIA DI GIORGIO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2070) for the relief of Maria Luigia Di Giorgio.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

#### GHEORGHE JUCU AND AURELIA JUCU

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3929) for the relief of Gheorghe Jucu and Aurelia Jucu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 3929

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gheorghe Jucu and Aurelia Jucu, who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on February 6, 1964, shall be held and considered not to be within the classes of persons whose naturalization is prohibited by the provisions of section 313 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RUTH V. HAWLEY, MARVIN E. KRELL, ALAINE E. BENIC, AND GERALD L. THAYER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1836) for the relief of Ruth V. Hawley, Marvin E. Krell, Alaine E. Benic, and Gerald L. Thayer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1836

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, on such terms as he deems just, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to compromise, release, or discharge, in whole or in part, the individual liabilities of Ruth V. Hawley, Marvin E. Krell, Alaine E. Benic, and Gerald L. Thayer, clerks at the Clare, Michigan, post office, to the United States for the loss resulting from the burglary at that post office on the night of April 27, 1968.*

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ROBERT F. CHEATWOOD, WALTER R. COTTOM, KENNETH GREENE, KENNETH L. MARCH, ERNEST LEVY, AND ESTATE OF CHARLES J. HILER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1890) for the relief of Robert F. Cheatwood, Walter R. Cottom, Kenneth Greene, Kenneth L. March, Ernest Levy, and the estate of Charles J. Hiler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

H.R. 1890

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following persons and to the Estate of Charles J. Hiler the amounts set forth in the following schedule:*

Robert F. Cheatwood.....	\$117.71
Walter R. Cottom.....	131.21
Kenneth Greene.....	117.71
Kenneth L. March.....	117.71
Ernest Levy.....	99.71
Estate of Charles J. Hiler.....	131.21

These amounts are in full settlement of the respective claims of the aforementioned individuals against the United States for per diem payments for Army Reserve active duty training performed at Reading, Pennsylvania, on detached duty from the Indiantown Gap Military Reservation, Annville, Pennsylvania, from April 19, 1966, to April 28, 1966, inclusive. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**CHARLES C. SMITH**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2246) for the relief of Charles C. Smith.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**RICHARD C. WALKER**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3749) for the relief of Richard C. Walker.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**SGT. ERNIE D. BETHEA, U.S. MARINE CORPS (RETIRED)**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3753) for the relief of Sgt. Ernie D. Bethea, U.S. Marine Corps (retired).

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**WILLIAM D. PENDER**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5657) for the relief of William D. Pender.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**JOHN BORBRIDGE, JR.**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5900) for the relief of John Borbridge, Jr.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

**JANIS ZALCMANIS, GERTRUDE JANSONS, LORENA JANSONS MURPHY, AND ASJA JANSONS LIDERS**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6100) for the relief of Janis Zalcmnis, Gertrude Jansons, Lorena Jansons Murphy, and Asja Jansons Lidars.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**ROGER STANLEY, AND THE SUCCESSOR PARTNERSHIP, ROGER STANLEY AND HAL IRWIN, DOING BUSINESS AS THE ROGER STANLEY ORCHESTRA**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4667) for the relief of Roger Stanley, and the successor partnership, Roger Stanley and Hal Irwin, doing business as the Roger Stanley Orchestra.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

**MRS. MARIA G. ORSINI (NEE MARI)**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1899) for the relief of Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

**JESUS MANUEL CABRAL**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1931) for the relief of Jesus Manuel Cabral.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

**MISS MARGARET GALE**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1995) for the relief of Miss Margaret Gale.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**MRS. NGUONG THI TRAN (FORMERLY NGUYEN THI NGUONG)**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2117) for the relief of Mrs. Nguong Thi Tran (formerly Nguyen Thi Nguong, XXXXX)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**MRS. ANNA MARIA BALDINI DELA ROSA**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3713) for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

**PLACING LT. GEN. KEITH B. MCCUTCHEON, U.S. MARINE CORPS, ON THE RETIRED LIST IN THE GRADE OF GENERAL**

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7500) to provide for the placement of Lt. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, on the retired list in the grade of general.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

**H.R. 7500**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, Lieutenant General Keith B. McCutcheon, United States Marine Corps, when retired, shall be placed on the retired list in the grade of general: Provided, That he shall be entitled to retired pay based on the highest grade held by him while on the active list.*

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7500 is a bill to provide for the placement of Lt. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon, U.S. Marine Corps, when retired, on the retired list in the grade of general.

The bill would do exactly what the title states but with retired pay based on his highest active duty grade—lieutenant general. No increase in retirement pay would be authorized, so actually there is no cost involved in this legislation.

Lieutenant General McCutcheon was nominated by the President on October 16, 1970, for appointment to the grade of general for service as Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps. The nomination was confirmed by the Senate on December 9, 1970. Before assumption of office, General McCutcheon was admitted to the U.S. Naval Hospital, Bethesda, with a serious illness. The medical conclusion in his case is that he will not again be fit for duty. There is every indication that his medical situation is terminal. Regrettably it was not possible for General McCutcheon to become Assistant Commandant, and another offi-

cer has assumed that post. General McCutcheon will be retired for physical disability.

The circumstances of General McCutcheon's case are most unusual, and certainly every compassion attaches to his situation. Very few precedents of this nature exist. Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault, U.S. Air Force, dying of cancer, was advanced on the retired list to lieutenant general with no increase in retired pay. Rear Adm. Charles C. Kirkpatrick, U.S. Navy, was nominated and confirmed for service as a vice admiral, but physical disability prevented his appointment. The Judge Advocate General of the Navy concluded that the admiral would have to be retired in the grade of rear admiral in the absence of special legislation enacted by the Congress. No generally similar cases have been found in the Army or Marine Corps, so there have been very isolated instances in the past of comparable situations.

The placement of Lieutenant General McCutcheon, when retired, on the retired list in the grade of general would give an equitable result analogous to that presently available for officers selected to grades up to and including major general under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1372 (3) and (4). These provisions authorize an officer to retire in the grade for which selected if his promotion is denied because of physical disability. However, since the officer selection process terminates with selection to the grade of major general and service in the two senior grades is by reason of appointment to a statutory post or to duty of great importance and responsibility, the advancement authorized by the foregoing provisions does not apply to the grades of general and lieutenant general.

Lieutenant General McCutcheon has served with distinction in three major conflicts, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. In Vietnam he held positions of great responsibility, first as commanding general, 1st Marine Aircraft Wing, and deputy commander, 3d Marine Amphibious Force, in 1965 and 1966. During 1970, he commanded all Marines, ground and air, in Vietnam. He has been in the forefront of the development and growth of Marine Aviation as an integral, equal element of the Marine Air Ground Team since the earliest days of World War II. His contributions in every grade throughout his 33 years of distinguished service have been vital in the development of concepts and techniques for the employment of Marine aviation in amphibious warfare.

Lieutenant General McCutcheon would have been the first Marine aviator to be advanced to the grade of general on the active list.

Gentlemen, I feel confident each of you will want to help in this compassionate act.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Keith B. McCutcheon is a man of dedication and patriotism who has served his country well throughout the years, wherever the Marine Corps was called upon to protect our Nation's interests. His record of service is one to which I

and all other marines look as a source of inspiration and guidance. Clearly, he is a man who loves his country and the Marine Corps.

I have personally known Lieutenant General McCutcheon and have seen him here in Washington and in the field in Vietnam. From my observations, it would be hard to find a man who deserves more to be honored by his fellow countrymen. He not only is an able and distinguished combat leader, he excels at inspiring in his men and those of us who know him the finest principles of citizenship.

A gentleman, a leader of men, a courageous fighter, a true and loyal friend, and a great American—all of these describe Keith B. McCutcheon. For these reasons, I strongly support this measure to advance him to the level of general of the U.S. Marine Corps upon his retirement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Private Calendar.

#### STOCK MARKET ACTIVITY AND GOVERNMENT SUSPENSION OF ABBOTT LABORATORIES INTRAVENOUS SOLUTIONS

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, a doctor in my congressional district has called my attention to some very strange stock market activity which preceded—by 1 day—Government action against a product of Abbott Laboratories.

On Saturday, March 13, the Food and Drug Administration ordered Abbott Laboratories to stop further shipments, except for emergency situations, of intravenous solutions until a contamination problems causing blood infection was cleared up. Intravenous solutions account for approximately 8 percent of Abbott's sales and Abbott provides 45 percent of the Nation's supply of intravenous solutions.

Between March 1 and March 11, Abbott Laboratories was not a big volume trader on the New York Stock Market. On 1 day shares traded dropped as low as 400 and never rose above 12,500. It rose in price on 5 days, fell on 3 days and remained stable on another day.

But on Friday before the FDA's public announcement, trading soared to 103,700 shares which fell heavily, 2¾. After the announcement on March 13, Abbott stock continued to fall in moderate trading for the next 8 days. In all, it lost about 12 points in the 9 trading days following the announcement.

This is a documented proof of insider trading.

I have requested the Securities and Exchange Commission to investigate the list of "smart" traders who sold before the adverse public announcement and determine how they developed such investment wisdom.

#### CLOSING OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITALS TREATING NARCOTICS VICTIMS

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, at the very time when more human lives than ever before are being shattered in the vice-like grip of narcotics, the administration has announced the closing of one of the only two Public Health Service hospitals in the entire United States organized to treat narcotics victims.

The Clinical Research Center at Fort Worth, Tex., is the only such facility operated by the Public Health Service west of the Mississippi River. It has been in operation for more than 30 years and serves patients from 33 States. If it closes, there will be only one remaining facility of its type—at Lexington, Ky.

In announcing the closure and shutting off acceptance of new patients as of the first of this month, the Public Health Service declared it would hereafter refer narcotics patients to some 235 so-called community-based clinics. It cited 14 in the State of Texas. Yesterday, my office was able to reach by telephone 11 of these. Some of them have never treated a single narcotics patient. All but two have no inpatient facilities whatever. The two with any such facilities are strictly limited, and one of them freely admits that its treatment has been heretofore unsuccessful.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I shall insert in today's RECORD a recitation of the responses received from each of these clinics as well as statements from eminent authorities in the field of narcotics treatment, and I invite the membership to examine the contents of this report.

To close this hospital at the very time when drug abuse is reaching such epidemic proportions is utterly incongruous. To rely upon such community clinics as the administration cites to take over this massive task is dangerous and almost fraudulently irresponsible.

#### REPRESENTATIVE ROUSH INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO HELP LOCAL COMMUNITIES DEVELOP AND IMPROVE THEIR COMMUNICATION FACILITIES

(Mr. ROUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing a bill to help local communities develop and improve their communication facilities. On March 4, 1971, I introduced this same bill with 40 cosponsors, today there are 16 more Members of Congress adding their names to a proposal to help implement a nationwide, emergency reporting number, "911."

It is the purpose of this legislation to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include in that legislation funds to be used by local

communities who wish to adopt "911" as the single, emergency number but who find attendant costs too high to meet. The actual installation of "911" is not costly, but many times communities must make a number of renovations and improvements to make the single, emergency number effective. This legislation is intended to help them meet those costs.

Presently under the Safe Streets Act the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration can make grants for this purpose, but presently there is no specific reference in the law to this purpose and no reservation of funds for just that purpose. The present legislation would specify funds for the implementation of "911" throughout the United States where local communities desired this service.

Mr. Speaker, so far when addressing this House about the need for improved emergency communications, I have concentrated on the aspect of crime reporting. However, I have always had in mind an integrated emergency communications system for each community which would be responsible for all emergency reporting, including fires, health emergencies, and disasters. I intend in the next few weeks to elucidate some of the important assets of a single, nationwide, emergency reporting number to meet these needs as well. While it is true that some communities will prefer to coordinate only fire and police, or only ambulance and fire services, or some other combination, the ideal is to integrate as many of these services as possible.

#### PROPOSED HEARING ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRESENTATION

(Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that Subcommittee No. 1 will commence hearings the latter part of June on various proposed constitutional amendments to provide voting representation in Congress from the District of Columbia. The exact dates will shortly be announced.

These hearings, held in the wake of congressional action establishing the position of nonvoting Delegate to the House from the District of Columbia, will be held on House Joint Resolution 253, which was introduced by Judiciary Committee chairman, EMANUEL CELLER, and several other similar or related proposals. Mr. CELLER's joint resolution is identical to his 90th Congress proposal House Joint Resolution 396, as favorably reported to the House by the House Judiciary Committee on October 24, 1967. This amended version of the resolution was the product of 4 days of hearings conducted by the full Committee on the Judiciary. However, despite the support of the committee, the legislation did not reach the floor of the House.

Notwithstanding the distinctive methods for providing representation from the District of Columbia and the different numbers of elected Representatives contained in the various resolutions, the

primary purpose of all of the proposed constitutional amendments is to provide the citizens of the District of Columbia with voting representation in Congress.

Broad public and committee support for the proposed amendments has been based primarily on the premise that participation by the people in their government is the basic principle of a representative government. Opponents of the amendment, on the other hand, have emphasized that the establishment of the position of House nonvoting Delegate provided the only practical solution, and national representation for District of Columbia citizens is a right, which is waived by those who choose to reside in the District of Columbia.

The subcommittee hearings will be directed exclusively at the proposed constitutional amendments to provide voting representation for the District of Columbia and will not be concerned with legislation designed to establish home rule or to revise the structure of the District of Columbia government.

#### DEMONSTRATORS SHOULD CLEAN UP THEIR DEBRIS

(Mr. McCOLLISTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who work in Washington have seen a lot in the last couple weeks. We have watched our clean white bridges smeared with sporadic smears of black and red spray paint. We have seen our flower-lined malls and parks buried under a pile of garbage, beer cans, and papers. And we have all been aware of signs which have been ripped down, park benches which have been used for firewood and monuments which have been decorated with profanity.

Now, in the midst of all the havoc, it appears that justice does, indeed, exist. Because of the skills and discipline of police, and the superb coordination between the Justice Department, police, and soldiers, a disruption that could well have grown to epidemic proportions failed to accomplish its purpose.

The dissidents failed, to be sure. But they still left their scar. And I, like thousands of people around the United States, am appalled at the fact that for many, it was as simple as paying their \$10 and going on their way.

One of my constituents, Mrs. Charles A. Tuttle, of Omaha, called me this morning, equally upset. She had a suggestion, and I would like to propose it to my colleagues: why not let the punishment fit the crime?

These are the people who overnight turned our downtown malls into pigpens. Let them clean up the mess. These are the people who were so busy with the paint. Let them get busy with scrub brushes. Why should Washingtonians have to bear the brunt of what, for many, has been a week of parties, wine, pot, and "doing your own thing" at the expense of everyone else? It is time these people took the responsibility for their actions.

Next time, instead of a fine, give them a bucket and brush.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO OUR POLICE AND TROOPS

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I think a word of praise is in order for the police forces of the Washington metropolitan area, as well as for the troops who were brought in yesterday to deal with the proposed disruptions of our Government. The most effective device of all, in my opinion, was to displace the mob from their encampment at West Potomac Park. This threw the leaders of the mob into disarray. In fact, apparently they have been unable to regroup their mob for effective action.

I congratulate the metropolitan area police force, and I trust that same display of firm discipline will be practiced in the future to thwart efforts to disrupt the functions of our Government. Those of us who feel a sense of security from the method of handling the proposed anarchy must be thankful when we recall the days of Ramsey Clark.

#### AN APPEAL FOR FUNDS

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is often said proverbially that lightning does not strike twice in the same place—but for the second time in less than a week the Democrats have attempted an assault on my Republican pocketbook by a direct mail appeal for funds.

Only last Tuesday, in a statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I called upon Mr. Lawrence O'Brien to remove my name from his mailing list of those being solicited for contributions. At that time I expressed my surprise that the Democrats were so desperate that they were begging for contributions from Republican Congressmen—but now after a second attempt I am convinced that this must be so and that they are really grasping at straws.

Once more I call upon Mr. O'Brien to remove my name from his mailing list. If the Democrats are so hard pressed for funds they should be more frugal and stop wasting their postage by asking Republicans to help bail them out of their financial mess.

#### CAPITAL MAY DAY

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the most infamous of all May Days in this Capital took place. Preceding May Day 1971 came the declaration and the avowed intention by certain subversive units to disrupt the Federal Government, to put a stop to the orderly progression of governmental affairs in this Nation's Capital. As a result the U.S. Government and the Washington, D.C., Police Department stepped in with everything that they could command, in a

most forceful manner, resulting in the arrest of 7,000 people who were incarcerated along with their infamous leader, Rennie Davis. I hope they make the charge stick on Mr. Davis, because he is one of the persons who is responsible for the most disorderly collection of hoodlums that this country has ever seen in the streets of our Nation.

I take this opportunity to say that a few of them, of course, will not be those persons who were justly picked up, and they will be, of course, discharged if found not guilty, but the majority of those who sought their level of water must now pay the penalty with submersion. Anarchy in this country cannot be tolerated and must be handled firmly.

#### MAY DAY ACTIVITIES

(Mr. MYERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much said in this body and the other body and the news media about what happened yesterday with the so-called May Day activities here in Washington. A moment ago a remark was made about what a terrible thing it was to make 7,000 arrests. I certainly agree. It was a sad day for our Nation and our Government when we had to make 7,000 arrests, and they could have made many more. There were many more anarchists running loose wanting to destroy our Government. I think we had to hold those people to save our Government and this city.

What really concerns me is that some in this body and some in the other body, particularly those with political aspirations who desire to be President of the United States, speak about the action of yesterday and talk of it not as an effort to overthrow our way of government by mob rule, but merely are saying it was counterproductive.

I am really concerned when we have prospective presidential candidates merely making remarks about the activity yesterday and about the anarchy in this country by referring to it as counterproductive and not criticizing it for what it really is, an effort to destroy our way of life and our way of government, and even our two-party system, our political system which I think every Member here should want to protect.

I praise the President for his bold action to stop this, the police department, the National Guard, and all those who participated in protecting our city and Government.

#### SHIPS TO TRANSPORT PRISONERS OF WAR, IF RELEASED

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest last week a speech by Secretary Laird in which he stated that he had been assured by leaders of neutral nations that ships would be made available to transport prisoners

of war for internment in neutral countries or for their immediate release. The following day, the managing director of the Swedish American Lines announced in Stockholm that his company will make ships available to carry Americans held prisoner in Southeast Asia if they are released.

Representatives of the Saigon government have made proposals to North Vietnam that all prisoners be released to the custody of neutral countries. This proposal has President Nixon's endorsement. Unfortunately, the North Vietnamese have not replied to this very humane idea. In light of the assurance of ships to transport the prisoners, I would hope the North Vietnamese will look with favor upon the proposal and speed the release of all prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Secretary Laird for the initiatives he has taken to free our prisoners of war and hope his efforts will not be in vain.

I would urge the Department of State to use every resource at its disposal to see that all neutral nations become a part of this humanitarian effort.

#### A JOB WELL DONE

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I think the Chief of Police of this city and the police force are to be congratulated for the method in which he handled yesterday's disturbance. There was very little blocking of the streets and no violence in arresting those people and no police brutality. They were doing what had to be done.

I called my daughter last night who is in high school back home, and she said, "Daddy, I heard and saw on television they stopped some man, and he got out, and he beat up a couple of them. Was that you?"

I said, "No, if they had stopped me, it would have been me." I want to tell you when I came to work yesterday and today, I was prepared, and if anybody tried to slash my tires, there would have been something going on—I do not mind telling you.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO THOSE WHO STAND FOR AMERICA

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, congratulations are extended to those officials of government, including police and military, who have faced up to the threat of anarchy in the Nation's Capital City in recent days. They are helping to preserve America and its institutions. The refusal to yield control of our Government to the riffraff which has descended upon the Nation's Capital is a monumental step. Washington and the Nation do not need the harassment which these and other demonstrators seek to perpetuate upon us. We are indebted to the President for accepting the responsibility for strong

action and to those who have carried out his decision so effectively.

America wants law and order. Now it is time to round up the ringleaders. Too few of them have been arrested. It is not enough to incarcerate the lackeys. The leaders also must pay the penalty. They have conspired against the Government and the people of the United States. There are laws against conspiracy. Let the laws be enforced.

#### SYMPATHIZES WITH DEMONSTRATORS

(Mrs. ABZUG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I share with many people a difference of opinion as to the tactics that were used by some of the demonstrators here yesterday. But I think it is very foolish we do not recognize that much of this activity is caused by our refusal to respond to their demands as well as to the demands of 73 percent of the people of this country for action on the part of the House to end this war.

The people have spoken out, people who represent both sides of this aisle.

The people are asking that we withdraw all of our efforts and energies from a war which has been overwhelmingly rejected by the people, a war which has never been consented to by this House, and which is being conducted now illegally and unconstitutionally by the President of the United States without our consent. We have removed the legal pretext of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. We have adopted the Cooper-Church amendment, which originally tried to prevent the kind of invasion which recently took place in Laos.

But the war goes on, and according to the President's remarks, will go on. And the people feel a need to create a sense of urgency in this venerable body. We must act now to end the war, to end our military involvement in Southeast Asia, to limit our military spending, to address ourselves to the problems in this country we have neglected for so long, and restore the confidence of the American people in the power and representativeness of this U.S. Congress.

I should like to make one further comment about due process. All our citizens are entitled to the safeguards of the Constitution. It is our most fundamental law. They are entitled to its protection in the ordinary running of their lives and in times of crisis. What we have been witnessing the last 2 days in this city has been a complete disregard of these fundamental rights. Many innocent people have been picked up by the police, many have never been advised of the charges against them; many have had no access to a lawyer to advise them of their rights. We who are the lawmakers should not tolerate this. We must end this illegal war in Indochina now and we must create a system of justice which can function in crisis in accord with the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from New York has expired.

**TRIBUTE TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE DEPARTMENT AND NATIONAL GUARD**

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask for this time to debate the war in Vietnam, but as a passing comment, 62.5 percent of my own constituents support President Nixon's stand in Vietnam.

But I did take the floor to indicate my immense pride in the Washington Police Department. They did an outstanding job yesterday and today, under the most trying circumstances, in keeping the traffic moving and in keeping the Capital of the United States safe. All of us in this Chamber, in this city, and in this country owe these police officers, who have worked long and hard into the night, a tremendous vote of thanks. It is a source of personal pride to me that so many of my own constituents and so many of my personal friends are included among these dedicated police officers.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I believe the gentleman would include also the District of Columbia National Guard.

Mr. HOGAN. I would accept that amendment, Mr. Speaker, and thank the gentleman from Mississippi for his reminder. I most certainly include the District of Columbia National Guard in my commendation.

**CONGRESSIONAL VOTE ON VIETNAM WAR**

(Mr. RIEGLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, an earlier speaker made the comment that if the war were to end tomorrow, the problems of the country would go on. I suspect some would go on. But I think it would be well if we could end the war and find out exactly what effect it would have in calming things down here at home.

The gentlewoman from New York made a good point. She said in effect that there has been a different kind of work stoppage around here for the last 10 years, and that is with respect to the Congress not facing up to the issue of the war in Vietnam. Let us not kid ourselves. Everyone in this Chamber knows that we have not had one vote on the war in Vietnam in either the House or the Senate in the last 10 years, and I mean a direct "yes" or "no" vote on the war in Vietnam. We even hide the money for the war in Vietnam in the Defense appropriation so that we do not have to have a specific vote on the issue.

So we do not have to congratulate ourselves on the failure of work stoppages elsewhere, when we have had a work stoppage in defiance of the Constitution right here in the House for the last 10 years.

**GOVERNMENT AGENCIES SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM WASHINGTON, D.C.**

(Mr. SMITH of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have a little different observation to make than some. It seems to me that when a relatively small number of people can cause so much concern and could possibly disrupt government in Washington, it is time seriously to think about moving some of the offices and agencies out of Washington. We have talked about this for a good many years, but as the Government expands and gets bigger and bigger, we continue to put about 90 percent of the agencies and increased functions into this area. I think we should look at every bill that comes up, and every time we can do so, move an office or part of an office out of Washington.

**PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO FORBID OVERNIGHT CAMPING ON FEDERAL PARKS AND OTHER PUBLIC LANDS**

(Mr. LONG of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, in 1969 the House passed a bill—which unfortunately failed in the Senate—to forbid overnight camping, sitting in, or building a temporary building in which to sleep on Federal parks and other public lands in the District of Columbia and to forbid the issuance of a permit for such a purpose.

I am reintroducing this legislation in the hope that the House will repass it and that the Senate will this time approve it. I have added a section providing that penalties for violating this law will be up to 3 months in jail and up to \$1,000 fine per person, or both.

The so-called Mayday tribe encampment and its aftermath have done extensive damage to the city, although the fine work of police and troops in controlling the demonstrators has greatly minimized the scope of disruptive activities. West Potomac Park, the campsite of the demonstrations, is covered with litter which will cost thousands of dollars to remove. Far more serious has been costly damage to private property in some areas and the tremendous expense of calling up troops and National Guardsmen.

The demonstrators cannot come to Washington in enormous numbers in order to force their will on Congress and the Nation if they do not have a place to stay.

Parklands, set aside for public enjoyment and the beautification of the Capital City, should not be used as a campground for people planning to paralyze the operation of our Federal Government.

I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

**CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 70, RURAL TELEPHONE BANK**

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 70) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, to provide an additional source of financing for the rural telephone program, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 28, 1971.)

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BELCHER).

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a good report. We had very few differences to work out with the Senate. I believe the differences were resolved in the best way, and it is a good conference report and ought to be approved.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thoroughly agree with the gentlemen from Oklahoma that this is a sound report and that it is a reasonable compromise and that it is in line with what I believe the House wants to pass. I, therefore, urge the House to accept the report.

The gentleman from California (Mr. TEAGUE) is not on the floor now, but I talked with him only a few moments ago. He is interested in a fair consideration of the report. He does not want to delay anything, but he is not in favor of this report, and I would not want the printed record to place him in a false light.

All of the other conferees felt it was a good report. As a matter of fact, I believe we probably have a better bill now than the bill which came from the committee. I feel that both the bill and the report are two restrictive but they do let us get moving in the direction we should have moved years ago.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure and I congratulate the conferees on their efforts, and urge its passage.

Mr. POAGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTAL SERVICE TO RECEIVE PASSPORT APPLICATIONS**

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 409 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 409

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 531) to authorize the United States Postal Service to receive the fee of \$2 for execution of an application for a passport, and all points of order against section 1 of said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 409 provides for consideration of a Senate bill, S. 531, which, as reported by our Committee on Foreign Affairs, would authorize the U.S. Postal Service to receive the fee of \$2 for execution of an application for a passport. The resolution provides that points of order against section 1 of the bill, providing for the transfer of such funds to the Postal Service, are waived.

Mr. Speaker, S. 531 would authorize the Secretary of State to transfer to the Postal Service the execution fee of \$2 for each passport application executed by postal officials. This would be accomplished by making periodic adjustments on the books of the Treasury.

Passport applications have increased 140 percent during the period from 1960 to 1969, and this increase is expected to continue. State Department passport agencies and Federal district court clerks have been swamped with applications. It has also been found that more people must travel great distances in order to apply for passports.

To meet this passport-application crisis, the Department of State and the Post Office Department on July 1, 1970, agreed to start a pilot program for the acceptance of passport applications at certain first-class post offices in the State of Connecticut and in Detroit, Mich., and Houston, Tex. The State Department agreed to reimburse the Post Office Department \$2 for each passport application executed by it since that is the same amount that is charged for this service by present offices which are authorized to process passport applications.

The pilot program has been successful and this legislation would provide for

needed expansion of the service throughout the United States. The proposed authorization would expire on June 30, 1973. It is expected that by that time the departments concerned will have had sufficient experience to determine whether the procedures for reimbursement are satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the rule in order that S. 531 may be considered.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of State to transfer to the U.S. Postal Service the execution fee—\$2—for each passport application handled by postal officials.

Currently, passport applications are accepted at 10 State Department passport agencies located in cities around the country and by clerks of Federal district courts. These have been overwhelmed by ever-increasing applications as Americans continue to travel abroad in ever-increasing numbers. This legislation will provide a convenient and nearby location for many more Americans to apply for passports, at their local post office.

A pilot project was begun on July 1, 1970, mutually operated by the Department of State and the Postal Service in Connecticut and Detroit, Mich. It has been a success. This legislation would make it national in scope, bringing closer to many people a place to apply for their passports. The bill also permits the Secretary of State to have the Treasury credit the account of the Postal Service in the amount of \$2 for each passport application processed by the Postal Service.

No cost estimate is available. Because the pilot project was very small in scope, no accurate estimate of expense or number of applications processed by the Postal Service is now possible. The authority provided in this legislation expires on June 30, 1973; by that time sufficient information should be available to determine whether the program should be made permanent.

The committee reported the bill by a vote of 20 to 3.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 531) to authorize the U.S. Postal Service to receive the fee of \$2 for execution of an application for a passport.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill S. 531, with Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.  
By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. THOMSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has one simple purpose—to provide greater convenience for American citizens who wish to travel abroad.

A passport is a necessary document for any citizen who wants to leave the United States. The passport itself is issued only by the Department of State, either in Washington or at one of its 10 passport agencies around the country. The problem which this bill addresses is the matter of making application for the passport.

When an individual applies for a passport, he must fill out an application blank with basic vital statistics, give evidence that he is a citizen, such as a birth certificate or naturalization papers, and supply two photographs. Applications are presently taken at one of the U.S. passport agencies, a clerk of a Federal court, or a State court having naturalization jurisdiction. At the time of application, the individual pays \$2 for the application and \$10 for the passport itself. In the case of applications before a Federal authority, the \$2 is paid into the Treasury. The law permits State courts to retain the \$2 fee.

It may appear that there are plenty of places at which an individual can apply for a passport. The fact is, however, that more Americans are going abroad than ever before. Something like 2 million people will apply for passports this year. Many of them do not live close to a passport agency or a Federal court. State courts are heavily burdened with judicial duties and give passport applications a low priority. In fact, a number of State courts will not take applications. In others, it is necessary to make an appointment several weeks in advance just to have the clerk check and accept the application.

Last year the problem of service to the citizen became so critical in some areas that 45 Members of this body introduced or sponsored bills to improve passport processing. My subcommittee held a number of hearings on this subject at which Members of this body appeared or to which they submitted statements in support of improved service. The Department of State acknowledged the problem. In light of this overwhelming evidence, the subcommittee determined that corrective action was necessary.

Shortly after our hearings concluded, the Secretary of State's Committee to Facilitate Travel made its report in which it recommended that the U.S. Postal Service accept applications. Rather than press for passage of legislation we decided to let this proposal be tried on a pilot basis. By arrangement between the

Department of State and the Postal Service, 11 centers where there are first-class post offices were authorized to accept applications. As in the case of other application centers the charge is \$2 for the application. This sum goes to the Treasury. The State Department has been able to reimburse the Postal Service for each application it handles from its regular appropriations. So long as the program has been on a limited basis the Department has been able to draw on its appropriations. If, however, the arrangement is to be expanded, some better way must be found to provide reimbursement to the Postal Service.

The purpose of this bill is to reduce the mechanics of bookkeeping while, at the same time, maintaining fiscal responsibility in the handling of public funds. The Postal Service will deposit the fees it collects in a separate account which periodically will be transferred to it.

I can think of no simpler, less costly, and more expeditious way to give the public the service it deserves. Many of the bills that were introduced provided for more passport agencies financed out of a revolving fund. Members should realize that the work of the passport agency is highly seasonal—heaviest from May to October. To set up more places around the country would mean additional rent, office equipment and salaries. Many employees would be seasonal workers. It is estimated that each new passport agency office will cost more than \$100,000.

But more passport agency offices will not resolve the issue. Thousands of Americans all over the country will still be far removed from these new offices.

Some argue that the use of post office facilities will interfere with the mail service. This is nonsense. In the first place, the only post offices that will be used are first-class post offices. Every one of them has a window with a bonded employee to handle items such as registered mail. These employees have nothing to do with the sorting or delivery of the regular mail.

Every State has a number of first-class post offices so the workload on any one of them will be minimal. Moreover, the greatest demand for applications comes at the time of the year when the post offices are least burdened.

A question has been raised whether there will be any diminution in security—whether passports will be issued, for example, to those seeking to evade prosecution. There will be no diminution of security. All that the post offices will do is what the courts now do—take the application. It still remains with the passport office to make the necessary security determination before issuing the passport.

I saw a newspaper story—evidently planted—that the rate of error in application handling by the Postal Service was much higher than that of the courts. I asked the Department for a statement on this accusation. Because the Boston passport agency has handled about 60 percent of post office applications, a study was made there. The error rate for applications made in post offices in that jurisdiction was 5.5 percent compared with a rate of 5.2 percent for the courts.

Finally, this bill carries a 2-year au-

thorization. Congress will have an opportunity to review the entire operation then and determine whether it should be extended or terminated.

I can think of no more efficient way to give the public the service it should have and still not add to the cost of Government. In fact, this bill will even produce a small amount of revenue to the extent that the post office is used instead of State courts. Frankly, I do not look on this bill as a big moneymaker. It will be a self-supporting service. And it meets the appeal of President Nixon to bring Government closer to the people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to pass S. 531.

So that there is really no significant difference.

This is an administration bill. The administration wants it. It was reported out of the committee, I believe, with only three votes against it. I urge that the House pass the bill.

Mr. Chairman, a couple of questions have been asked; I want to answer them for the benefit of the Members.

One Member asked, in view of Mr. Blount's edict, will a postal employee jeopardize his job if a Congressman intercedes for an applicant?

The answer is "No." The post office, like the courts, simply accepts the application. Neither the courts nor the post office can hold up the application.

A Member would intercede, if there was any adjudication to be done, at the State Department or the passport agency. That is where you would intercede. This would continue to be done. A Congressman can still seek expeditious handling by contacting the State Department or one of the passport agencies.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) for his comments on this legislation, but more importantly I would like to commend the gentleman from Ohio for his early awareness of this problem which has been confronted applicants for passports in the past, particularly with many people from the Northeastern States and Texas and Michigan, and other areas of the country. These Members came to the chairman and his subcommittee and explained to him the long waiting time which took place in certain urban areas in obtaining passport applications and getting them processed properly.

The gentleman and his subcommittee reacted sympathetically and held hearings, and did attack this problem, and did come up with solutions by providing the pilot programs in the post offices in Connecticut, Michigan, and Texas. I understand that it has worked well, and I understand it has reduced that long waiting period which thousands of people have endured.

Again I certainly want to commend the gentleman for providing a remedy to the situation which had heretofore caused so many American people to wait in long lines and in cities far distant from their homes in order to obtain a passport.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO). I want to say to the gentleman that this matter was brought to my attention as chairman of the subcommittee by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) and also the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN) and many others.

This has not been a problem in my constituency. There will be no post offices handling this in my constituency, but I could readily see that it was a problem for other Members. You always hear around here that Congress is not responsive, it does not react. Well, the Congress is responsive and it does try to react as soon as it is aware of a problem.

The remarks made by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO) brings up the next question: How many post offices will be made available for applications if this bill passes?

At the moment there are 11 accepting applications—eight in Connecticut, two in Texas, and one in Michigan. If this bill passes, the State Department plans an additional 91-32 in Massachusetts, principally around the Boston area for the convenience of the people in and around Boston who are having to stand in line. In New York City and in the suburban areas, 26; the San Francisco area, 24; and in Minnesota nine.

This is not to say that others will not be added if a problem arises, but these are the places where they have found a problem existing now, and these are the places they propose to correct the situation.

The third question that has been asked of me: How many employees does the passport division have?

At the moment they have about 300 permanent employees in Washington, and about 200 permanent employees in the field, plus several hundred temporary employees outside of Washington. The problem is to staff these agencies for 5 months of heavy work.

Some people said, "Let us open up more passport agencies." Well, this would just compound the problem we already have. This work for the Post Office Department comes at an off season for the Post Office. The big season for the Post Office occurs when the demand for passports is low, such as in the Christmas season. At times like that there are relatively few applications being received for passports.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of S. 531.

This legislation, which the gentleman from Ohio has explained in some detail, will enable the Federal Government to improve its service to the increasing number of Americans who apply for passports yearly.

At present, passport applications are accepted through the Department of State's 10 passport agencies located in principal cities, and by clerks of court in Federal district courts and various State courts. As the committee report notes, these facilities have been overwhelmed by the growing number of applications.

The program authorized by this legislation will enable the State Department

to expand the program for acceptance of passport applications at post offices. Such an expansion will be a great convenience to our constituents, particularly those who live in an area from which large numbers of Americans travel abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we approve this legislation and permit this new approach to the handling of passport applications.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MONAGAN).

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, which does no more than authorize the Secretary of State to transfer to the Postal Service the execution fee of \$2 for each passport application. I support this bill, because it does represent a substantial step in the direction of providing our people with the type of service they are entitled to in making their applications for a U.S. passport.

For several years we have been in a situation of crisis which the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAMMO) has referred to, a situation in our State, and in certain other areas. It has been said by the gentleman from Ohio that the applications for new passports in the Nation rose in 9 years by 140 percent, and certainly this was true of our State.

In addition to the rise in volume, the Connecticut courts which had always accepted these applications, refused to do so further, and, therefore, there was no place for people to go who had customarily been able to go a reasonably small distance to make their applications. Many of them had to go out of the State, to New York, in order to do it. So I think the Department of State should be given credit for taking this step. And particular credit is due to Barbara Watson, the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the State Department who after the report of the Special Committee To Facilitate Travel, which was headed by Senator Saltonstall, put a pilot program into effect. So successful has this program been that it is now recommended that it be expanded and that the amount paid for the passport should be transferred to the Postal Service to compensate them for the time involved.

Another beneficial result of the test program has been the fact that in our Connecticut probate courts some 97 of them have also agreed to join in taking applications for passports. So as a result of the activities of Members of Congress, of the hearings of this committee, and a result of the interests and action of the State Department, we now have an infinitely better system than we had before and one that is giving service to the people.

This bill, whose counterpart I introduced in the House, and which has been recommended by the Secretary of State, would expand a successful passport application test program that has been operating in Connecticut and two other States for the last half year. It would also provide an additional source of revenue to the Postal Service.

The need for efficient passport procedures has become only too evident during

the last decade. Between 1960 and 1969, applications for new passports rose by 140 percent. In fiscal year 1970, passport demand reached an all-time high. The passport office reports that it issued 2,079,863 passports, an 18.2 percent increase over fiscal year 1969. Fiscal 1971 projections forecast an additional 12 percent increase.

This decade-long rise in the number of Americans traveling abroad has of course strained existing passport facilities to the breaking point. Many applicants must now travel significant distances and wait inconvenient periods of time to have their applications accepted. Delays and congestion during the rush season have become intolerable. At passport agencies themselves, work backlogs and extra hours have become a way of life.

I have tried to remedy this situation for some time now, and am pleased that progress has been made. During the 1970 hearings of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I suggested to the State Department that probate courts in Connecticut could ease the annual passport logjam by accepting passport applications. In August 1970, the State Department enacted this suggestion, and during the 1971 passport hearings, the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs for the State Department, Barbara M. Watson, testified:

At our request, the Probate Assembly of the State of Connecticut approved the participation by Connecticut Probate Judges in the taking of passport applications. As a result some 96 Probate Courts in Connecticut are now accepting passport applications. These measures have ameliorated the problem in certain areas of the country. They are not, however, a complete solution.

I also wrote to former Senator Lev-erett Saltonstall, chairman of the State Department Committee to Facilitate Travel, and suggested immediate administrative action to improve passport application procedures. In June 1970, the State Department announced that 12 first-class post offices in eight Connecticut cities and in two cities in two other States would take passport applications on a 6-month trial basis. Miss Watson testified to the success of this program, especially for Connecticut citizens. During the 6-month trial period, 12 Connecticut post offices processed 7,074 passport applications. The two other cities participating in the program, Detroit and Houston, processed 2,408 and 1,485 passports respectively.

The legislation under consideration by the House today will allow the State Department to expand this successful test program. This pilot project has made more convenient passport service available at the community level, and it has done this through already existing facilities, with a minimum of new bureaucracy. The argument is sometimes made that the program will interfere with mail delivery. However, clerks and not mail handlers or carriers will normally administer passport services, and mail efficiency will not be affected. This legislation therefore deserves the support of all of my colleagues. Its passage

will provide an essential step toward efficient passport services for the American public.

There is an argument made that this proposed expansion of service would interfere with the moving of the mail. Certainly, I would be the last one to want to do that. I believe, however, that because of the type of clerks who would be involved, because of the relatively small volume, and because it does not affect the mail handlers and those who actually deal with and deliver the mail, it would not impose any substantial burden on the Department and it would be a source of income at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation, and I hope that it will have the support of all Members of this body.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, and for the reason that we have absolutely no business in Congress at this time, of all times, of adding additional burdens, not related to moving the mail, to the postal service.

I was particularly interested to hear the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS) say that even more postal employees are going to be used to process applications for passports in San Francisco.

The Postmaster General, who is also Chairman of the Board of Governors of the new Postal Corporation testified before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee only about a month and a half ago in his first appearance since the Corporation was established, and stated that in San Francisco it takes 11 days to deliver certain categories of mail within that city. Yet the gentleman from Ohio tells us that even more postal employees in San Francisco are going to be used, not for the purpose for which they were hired but to issue passport applications. The gentleman says it is nonsense.

I say how nonsensical can you be here today to load these added duties on postal employees who are unable now to move the mail.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I said—and I hope the gentleman listened carefully—that no employee who is engaged in moving the mail would be used for this purpose; that they would be bonded clerks who are involved in handling registered mail, and things like that.

If you go into a big post office, you can find them standing there doing nothing. In their spare time they would be accepting these applications.

I know mail does not move, not only in San Francisco but in other places, but by using people who are not involved in moving the mail, I cannot possibly see any objection to this measure.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman assumes that all that is involved in the issuance of passports in a first-class post office in this country is someone standing at a window. I doubt if the committee, in its hearings, went into the question of how many hours are spent by employees of the various post offices answering tele-

phone inquiries concerning the issuance of passport applications?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The post offices will not issue passports.

Mr. GROSS. I said passport applications.

Mr. HAYS. They do not issue the application. They take the completed application, check the photographs to determine that they are of the applicant, take his oath that his answers are true. That is all. It is then sent to the passport agency. He pays \$2 for the application and \$10 for the passport.

Mr. GROSS. All right. All right. It is a process of providing a passport application. If you want to play around with semantics, go right ahead. The fact remains that there is now a duty and a responsibility upon certain postal employees, not only to process passport applications, but to answer their telephones in season and out and provide information on the procedure for making these applications.

Mr. HAYS. I do not think there will be any telephones.

Mr. GROSS. I say again that the Postal Service has no business taking on this added duty and I do not care whether it is a clerk at a window or an employee answering the telephone and trying to provide information. Their business is to move the mail; to collect and distribute the mail. It is not to process passport applications.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I do not know about the gentleman's constituents, but my constituents are too smart to call a Government bureau about anything, because they know they are not going to get an answer, whether it is the post office, passport agency, or what have you. If they want an answer, they call my office.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I would hate to think that all the wisdom in the world reposes in any Congressman's office, or that all the answers to everything are to be found in the gentleman's office. Sooner or later the gentleman has to go to the bureaucracy. Do you not do so?

Mr. HAYS. All the time, every time, but the bureaucracy will respond to a Congressman whereas normally they give a constituent a smart aleck answer.

Mr. GROSS. I am absolutely opposed to this imposition of new duties upon those who man the Postal Service until, and unless, it demonstrates to the public that the mail is being moved with certainty and expeditiously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GROSS. May I have 2 additional minutes?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Iowa 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Recently, I read the story of a woman in Philadelphia who lost a valuable parcel

that was being transported through the mail. After repeated and prolonged efforts to find some trace of this valuable package, the suggestion on the part of a postal employee was, "Light a candle and pray it may come to light someday."

The gentleman says the pilot program of processing applications in post offices has been successful. I see no evidence whatsoever that any official of the Postal Service appeared before the gentleman's committee to state on the record that the pilot program has been successful.

So far as contact with employees is concerned, I do not know what experience the gentleman from Ohio has had with the new Postal Service, but when I call over there I am told to whom I can talk and to whom I cannot talk. I suspect that is the gentleman's fate.

And the gentleman is now under the edict issued by the Postmaster General which prohibits him from contacting ordinary postal employees, and they cannot contact him. This means if the gentleman or any other Member of Congress has any difficulty in behalf of an applicant for a passport he is going to have to talk to the person assigned to him by the Postmaster General to redress whatever complaint he has.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman I was in that unfortunate status up until January of this year, and then I became chairman of a committee. Now when they give me that answer I say, "Listen, you: do you want to come up and talk to me or do you want me to send a Federal marshal after you with a subpoena?"

Since I have become a chairman I have found I can talk to anybody. Sometimes I have to get a little rough.

I agree with the gentleman it should not be that way, but I do not put up with that foolishness, and I have authority now.

They say, "What jurisdiction does your committee have over me?" I say, "Come up and I will tell you when you get here."

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether I should say it is fortunate or unfortunate that we cannot all be chairmen of committees.

Mr. HAYS. Unfortunate.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill. The Postal Service has no business getting into the field of passports at this time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASEY).

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I represent one of the cities that has had considerable complaint about the passport service.

Although this bill will not cure the problems for the city of Houston and its rapid growth, I do think it is a step in the right direction. As I understand it, additional studies are being made to try to cure some of the problems that some of us in the larger cities have that are not processing points or issuing points. This bill will alleviate the problems of the public in regard to standing in line

at one central point. I think when they find post offices are being used for the taking of applications—and, as I understand it, they may even have more than one post office in a major city handling them—that will be a help.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYS. They may very well have six or seven branch offices accepting them in the suburbs. I will say to the gentleman that if this approach does not alleviate the problem in Houston, we will take another look at it and a continuing look at it. I would ask the gentleman, if this bill passes, to let them continue it down there. If it does not work, if he will talk to members of the subcommittee, we will do everything we can to help them.

Mr. CASEY of Texas. I am going to support the bill because I do think it is a progressive step, and I want to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Ohio, and the members of his committee for the very fine cooperation I have had in trying to alleviate my problem. I could not ask for better help from the chairman and his committee, particularly the chairman. His interest has been greatly appreciated not only by myself but the people of Houston.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if this bill has any earthshaking significance. The discussion indicates that perhaps the subject is not one about which all of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs are very knowledgeable. I must admit, for instance, that I am not knowledgeable about the business of whether or not passports have been processed rapidly enough and what the reasons for the delay are.

My reason for voting against the bill is quite simple. I have an instinctive feeling that the Post Office is an inappropriate agency to be taking an oath regarding an individual's application for a passport. I have the strong feeling, also, that the Post Office is already overburdened in its primary function; that is, getting the mails delivered in a reasonable course of time.

I would suppose that if there is a delay, it may arise in part because of the difficulty in processing the applications here in Washington and not because of delays in the field. So far as I know, in my own area of New Jersey there is no undue delay and the process of accepting applications is one that can be handled without resort to post offices.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think New Jersey probably does not have much of a problem. I think perhaps they are handled in the State courts up there. Is that correct?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is the case.

Mr. HAYS. In Connecticut, for example, State courts do not handle it or

did not handle it, so it was necessary to go to a Federal court. The problem was not getting the passport issued. The problem was to have the application handled. It got so bad that you had to call up and make an appointment 3 weeks in advance with the court simply to get your application accepted. That is the thing we are trying to cure. My suggestion, if I may say so, the gentleman, is let the notaries public do it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say to the gentleman from Ohio that it does seem to me if there is delay in the field, perhaps the process should be changed. I am not quite sure what the significance of the oath taking is in any event, but I would think that a simple notarization of an application would be adequate to discharge any obligation that may exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. May I say further to the gentleman that I probably agree with him. Maybe we ought to dispense with the oath altogether. But when you mention that you get anguished outcries about security and that this would jeopardize the security of the country. I suggested let us use notaries public, and I got an anguished outcry from the Passport Division. They say, "Oh, we cannot do that. There are 50 States and 50 different sets of laws governing who is qualified to be a notary public. You cannot do that. You will be jeopardizing the security of this Nation." So we tried to do it in another way. I am not wedded to my way. I am just trying to break ground here to help out some Members of Congress.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. It underlines the reasons why I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, my basic reasons for joining in the opposition to this bill are based on my membership on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee rather than my membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I do note, however, one feature of the bill I think is positive.

I would hope the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman handling the bill, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS), would concur with me that it is practical to set a June 1973 limit on this legislation so we can at that point review the record that would then be available to us.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman knows that I am very strong for setting limits on legislation. The State Department comes up every 2 years regularly and asks me for an open ended, ad infinitum authorization to spend money for their buildings. Every time I say to them, "We will

give you money for 2 years and we will see how well you have done." That is the reason for it. We do want to take another look at it and we do want to get the evidence and we do want to see if the plan works. And, I will say to the gentleman that if it does not work, I will be the first one to try to go to some other method.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

I should like to remind the Members that in the basic thrust of the recent postal service reorganization we have, in effect, segregated the postal service from the rest of the Federal Government. For example, the employees of the postal service will no longer be civil service employees. They will be covered by a contract negotiated by management and labor. The operation of the department will basically be beyond the jurisdiction of even the President who will appoint nine members of the Board of Directors, but who will have little control over them or their policy.

The question might well arise as to whether or not 2 years from now the Postal Service will wish to keep this additional obligation and responsibility.

Incidentally, I noted when testimony on this matter took place before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in July 1970, at that time the Post Office indicated that this was a test, they did not indicate any great desire or, frankly, any real opposition to being handed this assignment. However, in testimony presented to the committee they did list a number of services that they render for other departments and agencies of the Government, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Defense, the Peace Corps, the Agency for International Development, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior and Treasury.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. In fact what this bill is all about is that they are doing this now but are not getting paid for it. All this bill merely proposes to do is to allow them to be reimbursed the \$2 fee which the State courts now keep, but this will now be transferred to the Post Office Department. I suspect that might have had, in view of the big deficit, some effect upon their decision and that they are a little more willing, in fact, a little bit anxious, to go ahead and do this processing. But, basically, this is supposedly a trial.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, if this bill does not pass the Postal Service will not be reimbursed and I assume it will quit the business of processing applications.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I would suspect that the gentleman from Iowa, as the ranking minority member on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is much closer to the Postal Service than am I and is in a better position to speak for the Postmaster General.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am not at all convinced of that. You have convinced me to the contrary, last year.

Mr. DERWINSKI. But I do feel, Mr. Chairman, that this is a saving feature in this bill which is the fact that it limits to only 2 years the authority. I honestly feel that 2 years from now we may find the Post Office asking to be relieved of this burden. I would certainly hope that at least in this period of time we will have some statistics to show the real existence of error, and the problems that this may or may not cause. All we are working on is hearsay. However, I do wish to reemphasize that my personal opposition to the bill is based more on my experience with the Post Office Department than with the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support for this legislation empowering the U.S. Postal Service to take passport applications. American travelers now must apply for passports at the State Department's baffling few passport offices—just 10 of them exist—or at a handful of Federal and State courts. Now that the number of Americans traveling abroad is steeply moving upward, the bureaucratic delay and dithering they encounter in seeking passports is increasing proportionately.

People in my home city of Springfield, Mass., for example, often endure long waits, because of the mountainous backlog of passport applications gathering dust at the Federal courthouse there. In other parts of the country—indeed, in many parts of the country—the traveler's plight is equally grim.

The welcome relief this bill would offer—in time saved, in redtape cut—is more than obvious. An experimental program allowing a few first-class post offices to take passport applications, in operation for almost a year now, has been a striking success. The legislation now before us, therefore, is not one of those visionary new programs that founder even before they begin. It is firmly rooted in first-hand experience. Bringing passport services to post offices throughout the United States, the bill would make traveling the pleasant experience it should be.

The right to travel freely is fundamental to our way of life, Mr. Chairman, and we in the Congress must do our best to keep anything from inhibiting that right.

Again, I urge prompt passage of this bill.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 531, a bill which will enable passport application to be executed in first-class post offices throughout the country. This is a simple and easy reform—but a long overdue one.

Last year I testified before the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the House Foreign Affairs Committee on the need for legislation of this sort.

At that time, I reported a situation which I had been observing for some time

in the Federal Office Building in Cleveland where one of my District offices is located. During the entire spring of 1970—and of this year—there have been lines out in the hallways of the building of 20 or 25 people waiting, long hours, to have their passport applications reviewed and have the oath of allegiance taken. Naturally, with my congressional office right across the hall, some of these people have come into my office to make some very formidable protests about the terrible delay and the congested condition of the passport office. This delay is not the fault of the Cleveland passport officials. They have worked hard to meet the load of work thrust upon them. They have done a good job. There is simply too much work for this small staff of two people to handle—last year they handled over 22,000 applications in a single year. As a result the service which has been provided is totally inadequate for the Cleveland community; the same problem exists throughout the country.

This is why I support this bill which will enable the Department of State to expand the program for acceptance of passport applications from a few "experimental locations" like Detroit to post offices in the areas of heaviest application load and eventually to first-class post offices everywhere. At present, passport applications are accepted, generally, only through the Department of State's 10 passport offices located at various principal cities and by clerks of court in certain select courts. This is obviously inadequate when one considers that the volume of passport applications rose 140 percent between 1960 and 1969. Since the Postal Service's workload is lightest in the spring and summer when passport applications are heaviest, the service will easily handle the extra workload.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will pass today.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to conclude debate.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), has said, this is a trial program. He said there has been no evidence adduced that there is not a big error; there is evidence. A study was made of the Boston office, I read that earlier, and the error is only three-tenths of 1 percent difference between the Post Office and the people in the courts who have been doing it for years and years.

I think it works. I think it will help the taxpayers. I think it will be convenient for the public. The bill passed, I believe, unanimously in the other body, and I see no reason why it should not be passed here. It is a trial run for 2 years.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

S. 531

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of*

*America in Congress assembled, That the proviso clause in section 1 of the Act of June 4, 1920, as amended (22 U.S.C. 214), is hereby further amended by striking out the period after "\$2" and inserting in lieu thereof "or to transfer to the Postal Service the execution fee of \$2 for each application accepted by that Service."*

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment and shall continue in effect until June 30, 1973.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (S. 531) to authorize the U.S. Postal Service to receive the fee of \$2 for execution of an application for a passport pursuant to House Resolution 409, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 241, nays 124, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]  
YEAS—241

Abbutt	Carter	Gallagher
Abernethy	Casey, Tex.	Garmatz
Abzug	Ceiler	Gaydos
Adams	Cleveland	Glaime
Anderson,	Collins, Tex.	Gibbons
Calif.	Colmer	Gonzalez
Anderson, Ill.	Conable	Grasso
Andrews, Ala.	Conte	Gray
Annunzio	Conyers	Green, Oreg.
Aspin	Corman	Griffiths
Aspinall	Coughlin	Hagan
Badillo	Culver	Hamilton
Barrett	Daniels, N.J.	Hanley
Begich	Danielson	Hanna
Belcher	de la Garza	Hansen, Idaho
Bell	Dent	Hansen, Wash.
Bergland	Dickinson	Harrington
Blester	Dingell	Harsha
Bingham	Donohue	Harvey
Blanton	Downing	Hathaway
Blatnik	Drinan	Hays
Boggs	du Pont	Hechler, W. Va.
Boland	Eckhardt	Heckler, Mass.
Bolling	Edmondson	Helstoski
Brademas	Edwards, Calif.	Hicks, Mass.
Brasco	Ellberg	Hicks, Wash.
Brinkley	Erlenborn	Hogan
Brooks	Evans, Colo.	Holfield
Broomfield	Evins, Tenn.	Horton
Brown, Mich.	Fassell	Hosmer
Broyhill, N.C.	Findley	Howard
Broyhill, Va.	Fish	Hull
Buchanan	Fisher	Hungate
Burke, Mass.	Flood	Ichord
Burlison, Mo.	Fountain	Jarman
Byrne, Pa.	Fraser	Johnson, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Fulton, Pa.	Jones, Ala.
Cabell	Fulton, Tenn.	Jones, Tenn.
Carney	Fuqua	Karth

Kastenmeier	Morgan	Seiberling
Kazen	Morse	Shibley
Kee	Mosher	Shriver
Keith	Moss	Sikes
Kluczynski	Murphy, Ill.	Slack
Koch	Natcher	Smith, Calif.
Kyros	Nedzi	Smith, Iowa
Landrum	Nix	Stanton,
Latta	Obey	J. William
Link	O'Konski	Stanton,
Lloyd	O'Neill	James V.
Long, Md.	Patten	Steed
Lujan	Pelly	Steele
McCloskey	Perkins	Steiger, Wis.
McClure	Pettis	Stephens
McCollister	Pickle	Stubblefield
McCormack	Poage	Sullivan
McDade	Podell	Symington
McDonald,	Poff	Taylor
Mich.	Price, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
McFall	Pucinski	Teague, Tex.
McKay	Quie	Tiernan
McKinney	Rallsback	Thompson, Ga.
Macdonald,	Randall	Thomson, Wis.
Mass.	Reid, Ill.	Udall
Mahon	Reid, N.Y.	Ullman
Mailliard	Reuss	Van Deerlin
Martin	Rhodes	Vander Jagt
Mathias, Calif.	Roberts	Vanik
Matsunaga	Rodino	Vessey
Mayne	Roe	Vigorito
Mazzoli	Roncallo	Waggonner
Meeds	Rooney, N.Y.	Whalen
Melcher	Rooney, Pa.	White
Michel	Rosenthal	Whitten
Mikva	Roush	Widnall
Mills	Roy	Wolf
Minish	Roybal	Wright
Mink	Ryan	Wyatt
Minshall	St Germain	Yates
Mollohan	Sarbanes	Young, Tex.
Monagan	Scheuer	Zablocki
Montgomery	Schwengel	Zwack

NAYS—124

Andrews,	Frey	Preyer, N.C.
N. Dak.	Galifianakis	Price, Tex.
Archer	Gettys	Quillen
Arends	Goldwater	Robinson, Va.
Ashbrook	Goodling	Robison, N.Y.
Baker	Gross	Rogers
Baring	Grover	Rousselot
Bennett	Gude	Ruth
Betts	Haley	Sandman
Bevill	Hall	Satterfield
Blackburn	Hammer-	Saylor
Bow	schmidt	Scherle
Bray	Hastings	Schmitz
Brotzman	Henderson	Schneebell
Brown, Ohio	Hillis	Scott
Burke, Fla.	Hunt	Sebellius
Burleson, Tex.	Hutchinson	Shoup
Byron	Johnson, Pa.	Skubitz
Caffery	Jones, N.C.	Smith, N.Y.
Camp	Keating	Springer
Cederberg	Kemp	Stafford
Chamberlain	King	Steiger, Ariz.
Chappell	Kuykendall	Stratton
Clancy	Kyl	Stuckey
Clawson, Del.	Landgrebe	Talcott
Collier	Leggett	Terry
Crane	Lennon	Waldie
Daniel, Va.	Lent	Wampler
Davis, S.C.	McClory	Ware
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Whalley
Dellenback	McKevitt	Whitehurst
Dennis	McMillan	Wiggins
Derwinski	Mathis, Ga.	Williams
Devine	Miller, Ohio	Wilson, Bob
Dulski	Mizell	Wilson,
Duncan	Myers	Charles H.
Dwyer	Nelsen	Winn
Edwards, Ala.	Nichols	Wydlar
Eshleman	Patman	Wyllie
Flowers	Peyster	Wyman
Flynt	Pike	Young, Fla.
Forsythe	Pirnie	
Frelinghuysen	Powell	

NOT VOTING—67

Abouzeck	Cotter	Frenzel
Addabbo	Davis, Ga.	Green, Pa.
Alexander	Delaney	Griffin
Anderson,	Dellums	Gubser
Tenn.	Denholm	Halpern
Ashley	Diggs	Hawkins
Biaggi	Dorn	Hébert
Burton	Dow	Jacobs
Carey, N.Y.	Dowdy	Jonas
Chisholm	Edwards, La.	Long, La.
Clark	Esch	McCulloch
Clausen,	Foley	Madden
Don H.	Ford, Gerald R.	Mann
Clay	Ford,	Metcalfe
Collins, Ill.	William D.	Miller, Calif.

Mitchell	Rarick	Staggers
Moorhead	Rees	Stokes
Murphy, N.Y.	Riegle	Thompson, N.J.
O'Hara	Rostenkowski	Thone
Passman	Runnels	Watts
Pepper	Ruppe	Yatron
Pryor, Ark.	Sisk	Zion
Purcell	Snyder	
Rangel	Spence	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mr. Snyder.  
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Jonas.  
 Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Esch.  
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Thone.  
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Zion.  
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Halpern.  
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Don H. Clausen.  
 Mr. Runnels with Mr. Spence.  
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Frenzel.  
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Ruppe.  
 Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Riegle.  
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. McCulloch.  
 Mr. Watts with Mr. Yatron.  
 Mr. William D. Ford with Mr. Clay.  
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Diggs.  
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Dellums.  
 Mr. Denholm with Mr. Moorhead.  
 Mr. Ashley with Mrs. Chisholm.  
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Sisk with Mr. Metcalfe.  
 Mr. Mann with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Burton with Mr. Hawkins.  
 Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Alexander.  
 Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Abourezk.  
 Mr. Rees with Mr. Stokes.  
 Mr. Foley with Mr. Mitchell.  
 Mr. Cotter with Mr. Rangel.  
 Mr. Rarick with Mr. Davis of Georgia.  
 Mr. Clark with Mr. Dorn.  
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.  
 Mr. Griffin with Mr. Pryor of Arkansas.  
 Mr. Pepper with Mr. Gubser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN SELECTING SCHOOLS

(Mr. CASEY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution emphatically guaranteeing to the parents or guardians the freedom of choice in selecting the school their child or ward attends.

It would give solely to the parent or guardian, and to the local school authority, the right and duty of designating which school a student shall attend.

And it would state emphatically that such a decision "shall not be impaired or denied, either directly or indirectly, by this Constitution, or by any law, ordinance, regulation, or action of the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof."

This resolution, and this entire issue, has nothing to do with integration or segregation—for every child in our land is fully entitled to the highest quality education in the best of facilities that we, as taxpayers, can afford.

I view this issue solely on a basis which we, as Americans, hold so dear. And that is the right of our people to

select a home near a school, and expect that our children shall attend it. In doing so, we, as parents, consider such dominant factors as the quality of education our child shall receive, the safety of our youngsters in journeying to and from class, and the convenience of public facilities and recreational areas in the neighborhood of our choice.

The U.S. Supreme Court, in its recent decisions, has in effect denied that Americans have the right to make this choice—and that it is legal, constitutional, and indeed, desirable, that children shall be bused to distant schools to achieve some quota of racial balance set by a court.

The Court's decision, unless action is taken by Congress, has sounded the death-knell for the concept of the neighborhood school. And it is going to have a tremendously detrimental impact on the quality of education in the public school system of America.

Mr. Speaker, we, in this body, on several occasions have expressed our opposition to a program of forced busing through enactment of the Whitten-Casey amendments to educational appropriation bills prohibiting expenditure of Federal funds to implement such a policy. The American people have been vigorous in their opposition to a program of forced busing and the destruction of the concept of the neighborhood school system. The administration has repeatedly stressed that it, too, was opposed to forced busing.

As an attorney, I view the decision by the Court as highly questionable, and an unacceptable interpretation of the Constitution.

The joint resolution I introduced today will make it emphatically clear to all concerned that we believe that freedom of choice in selecting schools for their dependents is one of the rights guaranteed to a citizen by this great document. I urge my colleagues to join in support for this measure.

#### NEW ROLE OF TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

(Mr. FULTON of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the campus of Tennessee State University is located in Nashville, Tenn., in my congressional district. This great institution has a rich heritage of educational achievement and service to the State of Tennessee and the Nation. It is a land-grant university with a dedicated faculty and staff, a dynamic student body, and illustrious alumni serving throughout the State of Tennessee, the Nation, and the world.

Since its founding in 1912, TSU has produced 14 college and university presidents; nearly 30 percent of the Nation's black engineers; school superintendents in centers such as St. Louis, Mo.; Gary, Ind., and Detroit, Mich., as well as 70 percent of the black principals and teachers in the State of Tennessee, judges, State senators, State legislators, city councilmen, and many other local

and State government leaders. Since 1953, it has produced more than 300 Air Force officers who are now of field grade or above.

Recently the State of Tennessee Board of Education, recognizing the past services of TSU and its opportunities for greater future service to the State and Nation, issued a position statement on the new role of TSU.

So that my colleagues in the House may know of the challenging role assigned to TSU, I am including in the RECORD the most recent policy statement promulgated by the Board of Education of the State of Tennessee:

#### POSITION STATEMENT OF THE TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION REGARDING TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

At the outset we express to the administration, faculty and student body our deepest gratitude for the warm hospitality and friendliness extended to us at the March 16 meeting of the Board of Education on the Tennessee State University campus.

The Board has long recognized the singularly magnificent tradition of service provided the State and nation by this great institution. The presentations made to the Board by the staff and the President of the Student Council provided additional insights into the comprehensive role and operations of this institution and confirmed our high regard for its enlightened and dedicated public service. It is against this background of understanding of the past achievements, problems and aspirations of the University that we consider its present and future role and scope.

It is our genuine belief that in the future Tennessee State University cannot accept—nor can the State of Tennessee afford—the outmoded past role of an essentially black institution. This is a Tennessee school, supported by Tennesseans, staffed by Tennesseans, and for the most part, serving Tennesseans. It is a Land-Grant institution.

Tennessee State University must move from the traditionally black school position of relative isolation into the mainstream of the total educational function serving all Tennesseans regardless of race and ethnic heritage.

To accomplish this objective, the cooperation of the total Tennessee community is required—service organizations, social groups, government agencies, other educational institutions—all must realize that here at Tennessee State University there is now, and exists for the future, an educational base on which we must build a viable institution to better serve all the citizens of Tennessee. This Board expresses its full faith and confidence in the ability of Tennessee State University—its administration, faculty, and student body—to serve the educational needs of the many individuals and groups in the State.

We call upon Tennessee State University to exercise its most creative talents and ingenuity to plan, devise, propose, promote and implement policies, programs, and attitudes that will move this institution into more progressive activities to serve not just the black community but all the citizens of Tennessee.

Unanimously adopted by the Tennessee State, State Board of Education, March 16, 1971.

#### RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE INTERMENT OF UNKNOWN SOLDIER OF VIETNAM WAR IN ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a House joint resolution to authorize the interment of an unknown soldier from the Vietnam war in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va., to be implemented after the United States has concluded its participation in the hostilities in Southeast Asia.

Fifty-one years ago, on December 21, 1920, a similar resolution was introduced in the House, the adoption of which resulted in the creation of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Over the years, that marble monument which is the final resting place of a fightingman from World War I, whose identity is known only to God, has become a national shrine, representing the American ideals of valor, duty, sacrifice, and patriotism. Protected by a guard of honor during daylight hours, it has become a symbol for all our citizens of the American spirit of freedom and democracy which are the cornerstones of our Republic in both times of peace and times of war.

The original resolution which resulted in the establishment of this shrine was introduced in Congress by my father, Hamilton Fish. It was the last piece of legislation signed into law by President Woodrow Wilson, before he left office in March 1921.

Unknown casualties of World War II and the Korean war have joined their comrade of World War I and are also enshrined near the tomb at Arlington. The action to place these unnamed and unknown representatives of those who died in those later conflicts was made through Executive order issued by President Eisenhower in 1958.

The House joint resolution I have introduced today reads as follows:

H.J. RES. —

*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to cause to be brought to the United States, a body of an American who was a member of the Armed Forces, who served in Southeast Asia and who lost his life during the Vietnam War and whose identity has not been established, for burial in the Memorial Amphitheatre of the National Cemetery at Arlington, Virginia.*

Sec. 2. The implementation of this Joint Resolution shall take place after the United States has concluded its participation in hostilities in Southeast Asia, as established by the President or the Congress of the United States.

Sec. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Joint Resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution differs from the resolution adopted by Congress in 1921 in only one important respect, and that is the timing. That first resolution which established the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier was passed shortly after the cessation of the hostilities in World War I. On the other hand, this resolution is introduced while the Indo-China conflict, although nearing an end, still rages.

It may well be asked, why this difference in timing. Why have I introduced this resolution, which, when enacted, will

not become effective until the U.S. participation in the Vietnam war has ended? My reasons are many.

First, and of primary importance, I introduce this resolution at this time because of the unique difference in the nature of the Vietnam war from those wars which preceded it. It is a war which started so gradually that it was not immediately apparent to the public, or even to the Congress, what would develop of our commitment or what sacrifices would be required by those who served in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines in that far-off land.

Yet, in spite of the obscurity of its beginnings, over the years it has become the longest war in our history, has resulted in over 50,000 dead, over a quarter of a million wounded, and has involved 2.5 million of our young American fightingmen. Because of these facts it has mustered a lower level of public support than any other war in our history.

Another tragically unique feature of the Vietnam war is that, unlike World War I, World War II, or even Korea, the weight of the sacrifice has been borne almost in its entirety by those who have fought in Vietnam, and by their parents and loved ones who have grieved alone over the death or maiming or capture of a son, a husband, or a close relative. There has been no rationing. There has been no public or widespread sacrifice. Rather there has been a national policy of business as usual, so that the very real loss suffered by a minority of our citizens has tended to be forgotten or ignored by the majority.

Because of all these facts which have fueled public discontent with this conflict, opposition to this war has reached such a level that many seriously question the worth of the sacrifice made by so many young Americans. There are even doubts in the minds of many veterans who have survived the conflict and returned to this country whether their sacrifice and the sacrifices of their brothers were worthwhile. They wonder—and who can blame them—if anyone even cares.

I am introducing this resolution at this time of heightened protest against the Vietnam war, so that Congress, through its adoption can proclaim that whatever the war, wherever the battlefield, when an American soldier dies in hostile action his sacrifice is not forgotten; he has not died in vain. Through the adoption of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, Congress can show that, despite our divergent opinions on the wisdom of this conflict, one sacrifice is not to be weighed against another. We will be underscoring our recognition that there are no second-class wars; there is no second-class sacrifice. Death at Chateau Thierry, or Guadalcanal, or the Inchon Reservoir, or Hamburger Hill, is the same death—a death of honor, recognized, valued, and cherished by our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons I introduce this resolution now. I feel it is the appropriate time, and urge its adoption. On April 19, 1971, through administrative error the gates of Arlington National Cemetery were symbolically slammed in the face of Vietnam veterans.

Let us then, here in Congress assembled, throw wide those gates to honor and enshrine all those who have fought and bled and died in the far-off bitter war.

#### THE UNITED STATES IN SPACE— THE MANNED PROGRAM

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, within a very few weeks, my colleagues will be asked to consider the NASA authorization bill for fiscal year 1972. This bill, as drawn up by the Science and Astronautics Committee, defines a program addressed to two primary goals; maintaining the present low profile of the U.S. space program and providing a maximum return to the taxpayer on his space investment.

This article is the second in a series of seven over the next 3 weeks which will discuss the United States in space. It is my earnest hope that this background will provide my colleagues a fuller understanding of this country's commitment to space—a commitment leading to a better tomorrow.

The tenth anniversary of man in space. It is all the more appropriate to discuss our manned program on this the concluding day of man's first decade in space. On May 5, 1961, Freedom 7 was launched, carrying with it the hopes and prayers of the entire free world. For Astronaut Alan Shepard the 15 minutes of his first journey in space contained as much the element of victory as his first step on the moon almost 10 years later.

Ten years and \$24 billion ago this Nation dedicated itself to landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth. As a single goal, this project became as important and as challenging—and as expensive—as any major activity the country had ever undertaken.

Ten years later the success we have enjoyed has exceeded even our wildest expectation. As a nation we met the challenge; we achieved our goal. And undeniably the most remarkable aspect of the entire program was the performance of man himself—with man proving to be the most versatile and valuable of the entire complement of "equipment" our lunar probes contained.

But today with our Apollo triumph behind us we are faced with a serious question. The question is not whether we should have adopted our lunar goal or directed our resources to its accomplishment. The question instead asks what is man's role in space? What should his role be today and in the future, given the dollars we have invested in manned space and the results we have obtained.

No one can deny that the experience we have gained in our manned program represents a base of knowledge which has had beneficial impact on virtually every phase of our daily lives. Nor can anyone deny that the investment we have made in skills and facilities will be returned to our Nation a thousandfold within this very decade. Finally, in the strictest sense of man in space, no one can deny that until we are able to produce a machine with the intelligence, experience,

judgment and physical mobility of man, man does and must have a role in space. Man, we must concede, is the most highly sophisticated data sensing, data gathering, and data processing "device" in existence.

Interestingly enough, one of the major encumbrances of our present space program is the overwhelming amount of data returned by our unmanned automated satellites. Much of the information is valuable, but an inordinate amount is repetitious or otherwise non-essential. The system has simply been choked by unnecessary information. In contrast, man with his proven ability to discriminate and assess has provided a significantly higher return of essential and meaningful data than any of the unmanned space-borne missions. Man, as he is uniquely able to go to the heart of the problem, has relieved a major burden from the scientific and technical community here on earth.

The value of man is also that he is motivated. He is goal oriented. When he is impeded, he creates, evaluates, and pursues an alternative. And finally, man is creative and imaginative, a capability hardly challenged by even the most complex of equipment.

How does this translate to man in space? Apollo 14 is a most recent example. First, the entire fate of this \$400 million mission hinged on the ability of man to overcome a faulty landing system and touch down in safety. As an unmanned, remote controlled mission then, Apollo 14 would have failed.

What of the crews' other accomplishments? The geographical area they covered, the scientific instruments they set up, the experiments they performed, no robot will be able to duplicate before the turn of the century.

The obvious comparison is the U.S. Apollo versus the Soviet launched Lunokhod moon rover. Consider the clumsiness of the Lunokhod. Consider the lack of mobility of the device, the limited number of experiments it could perform and the meager amount of data it gathered.

This is not to deprecate the value of the unmanned mission. The manned and unmanned will, in fact, continue in existence as a compliment to one another. But it has been man in space who has greatly expanded our knowledge of the phenomena of space and established the potential value of his role. It has also been man who has clearly demonstrated a high degree of effectiveness as a space experimenter. In the estimation of the National Academy of Sciences, through our manned space program, we "now possess the keystone for a near-term understanding of the entire process of planetary evolution." Thus, the capacity of man in terms of his total ability and overall performance would, therefore, compellingly dictate his continuing role in space. And what of man's new role?

After the completion of the Apollo program in late 1972, our next manned effort will be to orbit a space laboratory, Skylab. Skylab is a direct adaptation of the Apollo system in which the last stage of the Saturn V rocket will be converted into a laboratory and crew living quarters.

The single most important task of the Skylab will be solar observations with the orbiting crew working in conjunction with special ground observation teams. The mysteries of our solar system were chosen as the focal point of activity because of their fundamental impact on virtually all of the natural processes here on earth. With the systems on board Skylab, including a large telescope, intensive and continuous examination of the entire solar system will be permitted for the first time.

The Skylab, of course, will have numerous other important objectives. In the course of the program three teams of three men each will visit the laboratory for periods of time extending up to 56 days. Therefore, one of the program objectives will be the determination of the effects of weightlessness on man over extended periods of time. Major emphasis, in fact, will also be placed upon investigating and solving many of our most pressing terrestrial problems. The entire topic of ecology, particularly pollution detection and monitoring, will be one focus. Oceanography, the study of current and water heat patterns, and food location will be studied. Water management and control, and forestry will be investigated. Agriculture will be another focus with stress upon crop production and disease detection. Finally, geography, cartography, and geology, including natural resource location and earthquake detection, will be studied. In essence, the mission of the Skylab will be the utilization of space to achieve a better life on earth. As a basic element of the mission, the Skylab work will play a fundamental role in determining the optimum mix of man and machine for all future space effort.

As imaginative and bold a step as the Skylab represents, when the program ends in 1973, this country will then close down all manned space activity for a minimum of from 4 to 6 years. This cut-back in activity is caused by the steady reduction in our space budget over the past years.

However, when, hopefully, the United States resumes manned flight in the 1978 time period, it will be within the framework of one of the most futuristic, efficient, and cost-saving concepts ever envisioned—the space shuttle. Picture a 707 airplane strapped onto the back of a 747 airplane. Then imagine the 747 "carrying" the 707 to an altitude of a few hundred thousand feet and returning to earth for a conventional airport landing. The 707 would then continue into space to place its cargo of people or equipment in orbit. The 707 could remain in flight for up to 1 week before returning—again to a conventional airport. The two vehicles could then be mated again for flight within a few days. That is the concept for space travel of tomorrow. The name of this reusable space transportation system is the space shuttle.

This feature of reusability will permit expensive elements such as engines, electronics, and structures to be amortized over many missions, possibly as many as 300 flights, rather than be charged to the cost of each mission as in the case of our present program of space flight opera-

tions. With the versatility and the economy of this vehicle, the United States will be able to place into space scientists and engineers as well as almost any size and shape manned and unmanned vehicles.

This impact on launch cost cannot be understated. In the first days of our space program, the cost to place 1 pound in orbit was \$100,000. By comparison, the Apollo vehicle was orbited at a cost of \$1,000 per pound. The promise of the shuttle, however, will be to reduce this cost to less than \$100 per pound—a reduction of 90 percent from today's price. The savings the space shuttle offers is the most compelling justification of the program to those critics who complain about the rising cost of our space activity.

But the source of even greater cost savings will be the new satellite designs permitted. Today's sophisticated and complex spacecraft costs on the order of \$15,000 to \$30,000 a pound to build because of the high reliability, redundancy, and structural strength we must provide to guard against failure. With the availability of the shuttle, our spacecraft can then be built using cheaper, more conventional design and more standard components. In addition to placing satellites in orbit, the shuttle will also be able to investigate any type of random satellite failure as well as to undertake periodic in-orbit repair and maintenance. The end result will, therefore, be satellites less sophisticated and less costly to design, launch, and operate.

The further implications of the shuttle are that it will do away with the large stable of boosters the United States now maintains.

As a final note, let me touch for a moment on the activities of the Soviet Union and its manned program. In terms of the total number of manned flights, we might casually conclude we possess a clearly defined lead. We have flown 24 manned missions; the Soviets 18. But a comparison of the number of manned launches yields a very erroneous impression. Perhaps we can discount that the U.S.S.R. accomplished the first manned orbital flight; the first full day of manned space flight; the first simultaneous flight of two manned spacecraft; the first flight with three men; the first space walk; and the first docking of two manned spacecraft. These accomplishments after all were duplicated by the United States—sometimes years later.

But what about the first simultaneous flight of three manned spacecraft, the record for the longest manned flight and the first attempt to assemble a manned orbiting space station? In terms of the longest flight, with time and good fortune the record will be ours—in 1973, 4 years after the record was set—providing the Russians make no progress in the intervening period. The space station? Barring further delays and budget cuts, in 1973 we will also be able to duplicate that feat.

Recently, we have read that the Russian orbiting laboratory carried most of the systems they have been developing for permanent use in space and that they now plan to accelerate their space program. Our space experts are now betting that this first space laboratory will soon be followed by the establish-

ment of permanent manned stations on the moon in addition to the extensive use of manned and unmanned vehicles for exploration. At the same time, it is anticipated that the Soviet scientists will be working on a reusable space shuttle, a prototype version of which was reportedly to be tested during this month. Finally, within this decade, we fully expect manned Russian flights to several of the planets.

Perhaps the measure of success the Soviets have enjoyed will permit history to repeat itself. Recall for a moment your reaction when the Russians launched their Sputnik I, then their 1,000-pound Sputnik II with an animal on board—and then 1 month later, when our widely advertised first launch attempt with a 4-pound "satellite" on board exploded on the launch pad. Imagine also your feelings if we had landed but a small mechanical tractor on the moon as a "grand" accomplishment to counter three teams of astronauts.

Man in space has made a monumental contribution. The list of benefits we have derived—tangible and intangible—is already endless. Yet we have just started to reap the benefits from our work and investment in space. To stop now is to waste the \$38 billion already spent. To stop now is to give up just when man in space can become productive. To stop now is to relinquish the use and control of space to the U.S.S.R. To stop now is to ignore the needs of tomorrow.

There is no justification for retreat.

#### THOUGHTS ON THE ARREST OF DEMONSTRATORS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Washington, D.C., witnessed mass arrests of Americans, the actual number exceeding 7,000, many of whom are here to protest our military involvement in Vietnam. Undoubtedly some of those arrested violated the law, either through acts of violence or by nonviolent civil disobedience. The people who did so quite correctly should have been arrested and tried. If found guilty, they should pay the consequences of their unlawful acts.

Those who came here to commit violence have displayed a lack of understanding as to what will move this country and this Congress. The violent actions of this week are, to use an overworked word, counterproductive.

In marked contrast, the peaceful actions of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War, culminating in the April 24 rally on the steps of the Capitol and led by John Kerry, had a positive impact on the country and the Congress, as did the hundreds of thousands of people who came on that day to peacefully petition the Congress to end the war. It is easy to simply condemn the actions of the violent who are destroying their own cause—without addressing ourselves to an even greater issue: that of the Government's indiscriminate actions yesterday. Over 7,000 were arrested; and I state

now with confidence that many, if not most of them, ultimately will have the charges against them dismissed because many were arrested in a dragnet operation which swept up many innocent bystanders.

About 10:30 last night, I visited the Washington Coliseum where approximately 2,000 of those who had been arrested were being held. Picture 2,000 young men and women in the pit of the Coliseum ringed by U.S. Army troops. The immediate and whimsical thought that came to mind was "Where are they keeping the lions?"

I talked with about 20 of these young people most of whom ranged in age from 18 to 22 and some of whom came from my district; the others came from all over the country. They asked me to call their mothers and wives to tell them that they were safe and unharmed. A number asserted that they were on the street not engaging in any illegal act and had been arrested without cause. Their clothes reeked of tear gas. The sanitary facilities were inadequate and it was dismaying to see long lines of young people being escorted to the latrines under guard by U.S. troops. I must say that the demeanor of the troops was excellent. They were friendly and courteous in their dealings with these prisoners and during the time that I was present the prisoners showed no hostility to the troops.

The young people told me that arrests had started as early as 7:30 in the morning and continued during the day. Not one of them had been "booked" by the police. They had been moved from an open-air stadium to the Coliseum which was enclosed because the weather in Washington was quite cold.

While I was there two members of the Justice Department—Will Wilson, Assistant Attorney General of the Department's Criminal Division and James Turner, Deputy Attorney General in the Department's Civil Rights Division—were present. They told me that bail for the "garden type variety" of charge, which, in effect, was a disorderly conduct charge, would be \$10 in cash. Those who had the cash were to be put on buses and taken to police headquarters where they would be permitted to pay their bail and be released. Those who did not have the \$10 would be held over night. The Justice Department had provided about 10 attorneys from the Civil Rights Division who were there on behalf of the Government to assist the police in processing the prisoners. There were several young lawyers, furnished, I believe, by the Legal Aid Society and the American Civil Liberties Union who were told that they would shortly be permitted to assist the prisoners once the processing started.

In my discussion with the Justice Department's attorneys I asked how it was possible that the 2,000 present, let alone the 7,000 arrested, could be charged when many of them surely could not be singled out by the arresting officers as having participated in any illegal incident. I was told that the officers had in most of the cases been able to make positive identification. I simply do not believe this to be possible with these large numbers. The effect of this kind of indiscriminate arrest is that it gives the nihilists, the mili-

tants who glory in violence, a great propaganda victory and weapon. The militant leaders are already saying that 7,000 young people came to Washington willing to violate the law in opposition to the war in Vietnam. They point to these arrests as proof positive to support their violent tactics.

I do believe that an overwhelming majority of the young people arrested, and surely all who were in that coliseum, are in fact opposed to the war in Vietnam and wish to see our Government, as I do, get out now. But the overwhelming number were not prepared to engage in violence nor did they contribute to the violence. What I fear has happened is one, a great propaganda victory has been given the nihilists—in prior years they took the name "crazies" and this year they are called the May Day Tribe and May Day Collective—and second, equally important, these young people have been radicalized to a far greater degree than was necessary or is helpful to our country or the cause with which they are associated.

When I left the Coliseum at about 11 p.m. to return to my office to make the telephone calls to the parents and wives all I could think of was Sinclair Lewis' statement, "It Can't Happen Here." All of us must see to it that it does not. As a Member of Congress I protest and will do all I can to keep it from happening here.

#### THE UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the 2.7 million Puerto Ricans on the island of Puerto Rico and the 1.5 million in the United States represent one cohesive social and cultural body and community. Solutions to the many and varied problems with which this community is confronted cannot be left to the Governor of Puerto Rico, the mayor of New York City or other State and local officials alone. We, in the Congress, have a responsibility to help meet the needs of all these—both on the mainland and on the island—and we must develop a coordinated and meaningful policy to deal with this community. I propose, therefore, the implementation of a four point program to begin to cope with the problems facing Puerto Ricans today:

First. In every legislative act that is submitted to this Congress that has to do with providing services to the American citizen in housing, welfare, health, education, job training, or in any other manner, I will request and, if necessary, submit amendments to insure that American citizens living on the island of Puerto Rico receive the benefits of such legislation to the same extent as American citizens living on the United States mainland;

Second. I propose and urge the Federal and Commonwealth administrations to immediately undertake a thorough study of the island's economic status with a view toward developing and presenting to the Congress an economic program

which will insure that the standard of living of American citizens living on the island of Puerto Rico can be comparable to the standard of living of American citizens living on the mainland;

Third. I will propose legislation to authorize community and economic development programs in New York City and other parts of the country to serve American citizens of Puerto Rican origin and, specifically, to authorize programs for education, manpower training and community development to be carried out in English and Spanish and with the needs of the Puerto Rican community built into the programs; and,

Fourth. I urge the establishment of a national employment bank under which Puerto Ricans who must seek jobs on the mainland could be trained in Puerto Rico to work in identifiable existing jobs in different parts of the mainland and at the same time receive such training, including in writing and speaking the English language, as would make it possible for them to be full participants in mainland life.

First. Including American citizens from Puerto Rico in legislation designed to benefit other American citizens.

Much discussion has been devoted to Puerto Rico's political future—whether it should maintain its present Commonwealth status, whether it should be admitted as the 51st State or whether it should be an independent country. This is a question which only the people of Puerto Rico should decide, free of any outside influence or pressure. However, until such time as a final decision is made by the people of Puerto Rico, the United States and the Congress have an obligation to recognize that Puerto Ricans are American citizens and to make certain that Puerto Rico receives its fair share of Federal aid and assistance.

Not only is Puerto Rico specifically excluded by statute from nine Federal programs, including the school milk program, the food stamp program, and a portion of the Social Security program, but it is also continually discriminated against through unrealistic and arbitrary ceilings or discriminatory formulas based on the low per capita income. Puerto Rico is presently being short-changed in such areas as school lunches, health and welfare programs, and educational assistance.

There is no logical reason in my mind why Puerto Rico should not be treated the same as one of the States. Some of my colleagues will immediately cry that why should Puerto Rico receive equal treatment when it does not contribute to the general revenues through income tax? Mr. Speaker, if most Puerto Ricans are earning less—far less—than the Federal poverty level, they are not going to pay taxes even if the Internal Revenue Act was applicable to the island. The fact that Puerto Rico does not pay income tax should not be a controlling factor in public welfare and medical assistance policy decisions. It would be a strange system that determined welfare eligibility by the amount of Federal taxes the prospective recipients were fortunate enough to be paying. Furthermore, Puerto Rico contributes to the general welfare in many equally important ways.

Puerto Ricans have been subject to the draft since 1917 and have served in all wars since World War I. In the current war in Indochina, for example, some 27,000 island youths have been inducted into the Armed Forces since the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was passed. This represents a higher proportion per population than in any of the 50 States, and almost 300 island youths have been killed in action.

Puerto Ricans from Puerto Rico are required to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States to the same extent as other Americans in all 50 States based upon the fact that Puerto Ricans are American citizens; then the same basis of American citizenship should be used to provide the Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico with the same assistance that other Americans in all 50 States receive.

This is not the case at the present time. Last year the Family Assistance bill, pending in Congress and approved by this House, provided welfare assistance to the extent of \$1,600 per family of four if they lived in any of the 50 States. The same American family, if they lived in Puerto Rico under this legislation, however, would benefit only to the extent of 55 percent. This is as absurd as saying that a Puerto Rican should only serve in Vietnam to the extent of 55 percent. If the Puerto Rican who lives in Puerto Rico is entitled to the disabilities of being an American citizen to the extent of 100 percent, then he should receive the benefits of being an American citizen to the extent of 100 percent as well.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues in the House and the Senate—particularly those who are committee and subcommittee chairmen—to see to it that Puerto Rico is included and equitably treated in every piece of legislation coming before the Congress.

If, however, I must undertake this task alone, I am fully prepared to offer amendments, where necessary and appropriate, to all pending and future measures to place Puerto Rico on a basis equal with the States. It must be clearly understood that I by no means intend to ask that American citizens in Puerto Rico receive anything more but that they simply receive the same as American citizens in the 50 States.

Second. Establishment of an economic development plan for Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico is standing at a dangerous precipice and its future direction and goals will be decided within the next few years. The current recession in the United States is felt as a depression in Puerto Rico. Hotels are closing, as we all know from the newspapers. But what is not generally known is that migration to New York City and other parts of the country has increased again.

The basic problem is that the number of jobs created each year in Puerto Rico is far less than the number of people that join the labor force annually. There is no program in effect now or in planning which would reconcile this disparity. Only when this is done can Puerto Ricans be said to have a choice of whether to stay or migrate. At the present they are compelled to migrate by economic reality regardless of policy pronouncements by the Commonwealth government dis-

claiming the encouragement of migration.

I propose and urge that the national and Commonwealth administrations immediately undertake a thorough study of the island's current and future economic status with a view toward developing and presenting to the Congress a comprehensive economic development program which will close the current gap between the labor force and the labor market. I envision such a program to be developed along the lines of the Appalachian Regional Development Act, designed to assist in resolving the severe economic problems of the island; to assist the Commonwealth in meeting its special problems, particularly in preventing another mass exodus to the mainland; in promoting and encouraging the island's economic development; and in establishing a framework for joint Federal and Commonwealth efforts in the area. The Congress should not be responsible for developing such an economic redevelopment program but the initiatives must be taken, and taken immediately, by the Nixon and Governor Luis A. Ferre administrations. It should be made clear that I do not intend that the Congress would impose a program for economic development upon the people of Puerto Rico, but merely that it would provide such assistance as might be needed and requested to achieve a higher level of development.

Third. Legislation for mainland authorization of bilingual community and economic development programs.

At the same time, we must not forget or ignore the Puerto Ricans in the United States. We must recognize their important and vital role in our country. They must be afforded every opportunity to fully participate in the society and in the United States' future. Puerto Ricans have special needs and problems, as well as separate identities, and our Federal, State, and municipal agencies must realize this fact of life.

The Puerto Rican community in the United States has made specific proposals to lift itself out of poverty. For example, groups such as the Puerto Rican Community Development project, *Aspira* of America, the Puerto Rican Forum and others have made specific proposals to various agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments. However, these proposals consistently run into funding difficulties and this is one of the reasons why specific authorizing legislation as I have proposed is essential.

As the third prong of my overall formula, therefore, I propose that Puerto Rican economic development programs—those developed and formulated by Puerto Ricans to meet the particular needs of Puerto Ricans—be separately and directly funded by the Federal Government. Included in such efforts would be the whole range of economic opportunity programs, assistance for small businesses, bilingual education, and economic development.

Puerto Ricans are not concentrated in one specific area, as are many other ethnic or minority groups. Thus, they often do not benefit from various programs aimed at assisting one neighborhood or geographic area. For example,

there are a large number of Puerto Ricans who do not live in one of the 26 poverty areas of New York City and accordingly, they are not benefiting from urgently needed assistance in housing, education, welfare, and other critical areas. Because of this situation, a comprehensive program for Puerto Ricans, wherever situated, is required.

Fourth. Establishment of a national employment program.

Finally, as the fourth phase of my proposal, I urge the establishment of a national employment program or bank, designed to provide job training for unskilled and semiskilled Puerto Ricans who are forced to seek employment on the mainland. This job bank would also assist them in locating suitable and meaningful employment—where available and clearly required—in various locations throughout the United States. These predetermined employment opportunity areas would not be in sections where there are currently substantial concentrations of employment and underemployed Puerto Ricans.

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has done pioneer work in this area through its migrant division which has a number of offices on the mainland. Under this program for migrant workers, developed by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico at its own expense, Puerto Ricans enter into a contract in Puerto Rico to work on farms in New Jersey, Long Island, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut. They are brought to the farms in the United States and return to Puerto Rico at the end of the season. This program clearly indicates that Puerto Ricans are willing to go to any area of the continental United States if jobs are available. Unfortunately, the program itself is a disaster because the pay that the Puerto Rican receives for such work is well below the minimum wage and the conditions under which he must live are disgraceful. What is needed is a program which would identify jobs in manufacturing and the service trades, jobs with a future which would provide a decent living wage. There is no doubt in my mind that even more Puerto Ricans would be willing to apply for such jobs than already apply for seasonal migrant farm labor.

The proposed program would be jointly carried out by the Federal Government and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and would include not only job training in Puerto Rico but, also, intensive instruction in written and spoken English and Spanish, where necessary, perhaps leading to a high school diploma or its equivalent to insure that once in the continental United States, the individual would be at a level which would enable him to more fully participate in mainland life and to compete successfully for other employment, when necessary.

It should be clearly recognized that the migration of Puerto Ricans from the island arises almost exclusively out of a search for expanded economic opportunity and security. The migration of Puerto Ricans from the island to the mainland is not for political or religious reasons, but purely for economic reasons. Moreover, it is not the migration of people in search of welfare. If it were,

we would find that the Puerto Rican aged would be leaving Puerto Rico. The fact is that it is only the poor and the young who leave Puerto Rico for the United States. For this reason, the median age of the Puerto Rican in New York City is slightly over 19, and Puerto Ricans constitute the youngest ethnic group in New York City and in the Nation.

As people are seeking economic opportunity, we should have a program to provide for it. The job bank I have proposed would assist Puerto Ricans in being more productive members of society and full participants in the economy and the Nation's riches. This program becomes particularly critical in light of a possible renewal of mass migration from the island to the mainland.

One may well ask, Mr. Speaker, how such a situation developed and why a program such as I have just proposed is necessary. In order to fully understand and appreciate the current plight of Puerto Ricans, it would be well to briefly review some of the background and developments over the past several decades and to examine some of the factors contributing to the current crisis.

Puerto Ricans were by no means a new phenomena on the mainland or in New York. During the early years of the 20th century Puerto Rican cigarmakers settled on the lower East Side. They were soon followed by merchant seamen on the island-to-New York run, who congregated near the waterfront in Brooklyn, and by women garment workers who were brought to sew in local factories.

However, massive migration began to play a significant role in the demographic changes in the island in 1940. Puerto Rico had a typically backward, traditional agrarian economy. Its economy was dependent on sugar and was a one-crop, export oriented island with a small land area, a large and rapidly growing population and very low per capita income. The small land area and large population resulted in a population density of 546 persons per square mile—one of the highest in the world. The island lacked any form of large or medium-scale industry; it was plagued by the scarcity of fertile productive land and the per capita average annual income was \$125.

Because of the greater economic opportunities which most Puerto Ricans thought would be available on the mainland, there began a steady rise in migration from the island to urban areas in the United States, particularly New York. From 1945 to 1962 nearly 578,000 Puerto Ricans emigrated to the United States, constituting 85 percent of the total emigration during the 20th century. The largest number—some 446,800—emigrated during the period 1950-60 which comprised 65.6 percent of the total emigration.

We must not lose sight of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are not talking about aliens from some foreign land but American citizens—subject to the United States Constitution and to all Federal laws of general application—with the exception of the tax laws—participants in a common market and in an economy integrated into that of the United States by various means.

At about the time that the flow of people from Puerto Rico to the mainland was beginning to peak, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico began its massive and highly publicized economic development program which came to be known as "Operation Bootstraps." This was a program developed entirely by Puerto Rico without any aid from the United States. It brought a number of diversified industries into the island through such devices as a number of tax benefits including "tax holidays" and tax-free investment to U.S. firms and a number of other attractive incentives. As a consequence, Puerto Rico has moved from an island whose main product was agriculture to manufacturing. Nevertheless, jobs were not created in sufficient number to meet the demands of the growing labor force.

The sheer force of numbers worked against Operation Bootstraps as the number of people joining the labor force was vastly larger than the number of jobs which were available. Thus, while conditions in Puerto Rico improved, the number of Puerto Ricans leaving the island increased at the same time. Without the massive migration to the United States, there would have been no dramatic rise in per capita income, in better housing, in expanded employment opportunities or other benefits which have been credited as the achievement of Operation Bootstraps. Had there been no emigration it is obvious that the Puerto Rican economy would have had to supply a great many more jobs than it has generated in the last two decades.

In fact, the peak net migration rate, which occurred in 1953, was sufficiently large to exceed the rate of natural increase and cause a reduction in the absolute population. From a percentage increase of 18.3 percent in the 10-year period of 1940-1950, the population of Puerto Rico increased by only 6.3 percent during the following decade. Although a portion of this decline can be attributed to reduced fertility levels, the major factor was the emigration from the island to the mainland. As George C. Myers has stated:

Without these migration losses Puerto Rico's population would have increased by 27.5 per cent in the ten-year period [1950-1960], and this figure excludes births that would have occurred to persons if they had not moved, but remained in Puerto Rico.

Total net migration losses were experienced by nearly all of the island's municipalities, particularly rural municipalities and those containing small urban areas. The economic reality is the fact that the economy of Puerto Rico could not—and still cannot—absorb the large, growing population. The labor market is simply unable to effectively cope with the burgeoning, and largely unskilled, labor force—I believe that Puerto Ricans should be able to migrate—but not because they are compelled to do so.

But what of those who left the island to seek their fortune and a better way of life on the mainland? Most experts agree that the migration I previously discussed was motivated primarily by the quest for economic opportunity. This is certainly the reason, for example, why my aunt left Caguas for New York as she believed

that she could earn a better living on the mainland than on the island.

Unfortunately, for most of the migrants, their aspirations have not been realized and migration to the mainland has not provided the salvation many of them imagined. Migrating Puerto Ricans had on the average less than 5 years of education; their knowledge of English ranged from none to bad; and many came from rural areas of extreme poverty. With their poor English and lack of education and any usable industrial skills, job opportunities were generally limited to menial, low-paying jobs in factories and restaurants. The employment problem is increasingly complicated by the fact that many unskilled jobs are gradually being automated and the Puerto Rican is being squeezed out of the job market because the work he did is being turned over to the machines.

While exact figures are unavailable it is well known that Puerto Ricans have a higher unemployment rate than blacks; a lower median income; and a greater percentage of school dropouts—more than 60 percent of Puerto Rican students never finish high school.

Puerto Ricans who are employed are more than any other group concentrated in occupations with the lowest pay and status. In 1960, for example, 70.6 percent of employed Puerto Rican males were in low-income occupations. Four times as many Puerto Ricans as blacks get public aid to supplement these low earnings.

Mr. Speaker, I could easily spend the remainder of this afternoon citing various figures and statistics to demonstrate the plight of the mainland Puerto Ricans. It should be obvious, however, that since the migration of Puerto Ricans is the migration almost exclusively of poor people, the statistics would logically indicate the existence of the worst possible conditions and the greatest and most urgent need for a positive program.

Even where Puerto Ricans do return to the island, however, there is no escape from the vicious cycle of poverty. The current per capita income in Puerto Rico is only \$1,426 annually—substantially below that of any State and almost half that of Mississippi, the poorest of 50 States. A recent New York Times article compared this figure with Venezuela's annual per capita income of \$902, the highest in South America, and with Mexico's \$600. However, Mr. Speaker, Puerto Rico is not a Latin American nation; it is an integral part of the United States and is, as I have mentioned, interrelated in U.S. economy. Comparing Puerto Rico's economic status with Latin America makes about as much sense as comparing Hawaii's with the Far East's.

Puerto Rico does not benefit from the mainland's minimum wage laws, a particularly controversial issue now being considered by Mr. Dent's labor subcommittee.

Although personal income has reportedly experienced an increase of 12 percent over the previous year—reaching \$3.8 billion according to a Journal of Commerce article—the average pay for industrial workers in Puerto Rico is approximately \$1.60 per hour, less than one-half the U.S. average.

Four out of every five Puerto Rican families on the island earn less than \$3,000 annually, with one-half receiving less than \$1,000 per annum. Unemployment, according to the U.S. Labor Department, is at 12.2 percent—a rise of almost 2 percent over the last year. However, in realistic terms, unemployment approaches 25 to 30 percent when you consider those who have been discouraged and rejected and are no longer seeking work. This is compounded by the fact that Puerto Rico's 2.7 million population will double in less than 30 years and we are now on the brink of another movement of massive migration to the mainland. In 1968, migration from Puerto Rico to the United States was over 77,000 from a near-zero figure in 1960. What is particularly tragic is the fact that many of the new migrants and potential migrants are now young people with some skills, a commodity the island can ill afford to lose.

In addition to wages being a fraction of those on the mainland, the cost of living in Puerto Rico is much higher. While exact figures are unavailable, some statistics place island costs at as high as 25 percent more than in New York, Chicago or Boston.

Mr. Speaker, because of my place of birth and background I feel a special responsibility for Puerto Rico and Puerto Ricans, whether they be in the South Bronx, in Lorain, Ohio, or in Caguas, where I was born. If we are going to meaningfully and effectively cope with our urban crisis and the impending influx of Puerto Rican migrants, we must make certain that Puerto Rico receives its full and fair share and that the island's economic development and progress is encouraged and aided to the fullest extent possible. I urge our colleagues to actively participate in this vital undertaking and to work with me in ending the current discrimination against Puerto Rico and in bringing equity to the treatment of "La Isla Verde" as well as to the more than one million Puerto Ricans now on the mainland.

Thank you.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BADILLO. I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished gentleman from New York, my friend and colleague, yielding. He has set forth a constructive program which is worthy of support by Members of Congress. He is to be commended for bringing renewed attention to the needs of the people of Puerto Rico.

It is unfair and grossly discriminatory that American citizens living on the Island of Puerto Rico should not receive the full benefits of Federal laws just as American citizens on the mainland do.

Puerto Rico is entitled to be treated the same as the 50 States with respect to food programs, education, and health and welfare programs. The exclusion of Puerto Rico or the application of discriminatory formulae to Puerto Rico is unfair. Therefore, I join the gentleman in urging appropriate legislation, and I will happily support amendments to insure that Puerto Rico is included to the same extent that every State in the Union is included.

Economic conditions in Puerto Rico account for much of the migration to the mainland which has occurred in the last 20 years. We welcome American citizens from Puerto Rico—they have made, and are making, valuable contributions to the mainland society. But, on the mainland they have also faced serious problems and too often are victims of poverty and deprivation. And added to these burdens is the unconscionable weight of discrimination.

Our colleague is correct in calling attention to the failure of the Federal Government to adequately respond to the needs of Puerto Rico. This failure reflects a general failure on the part of the Federal Government, whether deriving from inattention or intention, to address the needs of minority group members. This is related to the failure to cope with the problems of our cities. Since the cities are populated, in increasing percentages, by minority group members, the decline and decay of our urban centers inevitably means increased deprivation for them.

This failure also stems from an unwillingness to meet very basic needs. One example—and there are many—is the bilingual education program. This is a good, sensible program aimed at giving children who come from homes in which English is the second language a chance to overcome what might otherwise be a severe handicap—the inability to communicate clearly in English, the dominant language of the Nation. Yet, while the Congress authorized \$80 million for this program for fiscal year 1971, the administration requested only \$25 million. In fiscal year 1972 the authorization is \$100 million, yet again the administration only requested \$25 million. Of course, Congress shares the blame as well. It could have exceeded by large amounts the administration figures. Instead, for fiscal year 1971, it matched the administration figure, and for fiscal year 1972 the House has increased it by only \$2 million.

The dialog we are conducting today must focus on these failures, not only insofar as they affect the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, but also as they concern the millions of members of minority groups in the 50 States.

Mr. BADILLO. I thank my colleague from New York. I know I have had his support during the short period I have been in the Congress for the securing of additional bilingual programs for New York City, and I know I can count on his support for legislation of the type I am proposing today.

Mr. RYAN. The gentleman has made a very valid point about the fact that in the State of New York and in the city of New York schoolchildren who speak Spanish are being shortchanged because the bilingual education program is not being fully funded. And the funds which have been appropriated have not been fairly allocated among the States with the greatest need. As a result, children of Puerto Rican background in the city of New York are being shortchanged on their education.

Mr. BADILLO. Yes. In spite of all our efforts right now only 3 percent of the Spanish-speaking children in New York City are receiving benefits of bilingual

programs. That indicates how much we have to do just to provide for the needs of the Spanish-speaking children in New York City alone.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Congressman BADILLO, my colleague from New York, for his very thoughtful and constructive proposal to end the discrimination that exists against Puerto Ricans both in Puerto Rico itself and on the mainland and the resulting pattern of economic exploitation and poverty among these people. I myself represent the 19th District in Manhattan, in which we have large numbers of Puerto Ricans whose conditions I will be describing in my remarks in addition to what Congressman BADILLO said here today.

Puerto Rico is suffering an economic recession that is five times worse than the recession here in the United States proper. Because of the lack of economic development in Puerto Rico, consumers there are forced to depend on imports for almost everything that they use, eat, or wear. Even the rice and beans that are the mainstay of the Puerto Rican diet are produced and processed in the continental United States, where costs are higher, and then they are transported to Puerto Rico aboard U.S. registry ships, which increases the cost to the consumer.

The Puerto Rican workers, finding themselves caught in an economic squeeze between high unemployment and the high cost of living, come to the mainland looking for a better life, but all too often, as the thousands of Puerto Ricans living in the 19th Congressional District can testify, and all over Manhattan and New York State and elsewhere, this dream becomes a nightmare.

Initially, the Puerto Rican has to adjust to the culture and the language barrier, which for some of them is insurmountable. If he is lucky enough to find a job, he soon realizes that he has to work very long hours in order to make up for his inability to earn a higher wage. He starts at the bottom of the economic ladder, lucky if he is earning a minimum wage, and barely subsisting as his pay is based on piecework.

Most Puerto Ricans are just one paycheck away from poverty. A robbery or family illness may leave them no choice but to go on welfare. And so although many Puerto Ricans dream of returning to their native land with enough money to buy a little property and build a home, they find themselves again in an economic squeeze. In Puerto Rico itself the only future open to them is seasonable work in the U.S.-owned hotels or as service or manual laborers in the sugarcane fields. And here they could rediscover that when the depression comes they are the first to suffer.

Just last week when the financial crisis in New York City led Mayor Lindsay to project drastic cuts in services and employment, the Hispanic community in a statement signed by several hundred organizations, civic clubs, community corporations, store-front anti-poverty agencies, and civic groups that represent and serve the Puerto Rican population of our city, issued a warning that "the anticipated cuts represent the death knell for the disenfranchised of our city least

able to defend themselves in an era of spiralling inflation and governmental interference."

I would like to cite a few of the points made in this statement because I think it shows very clearly the precarious and vulnerable position of the Puerto Rican community in New York.

The statement, prepared by the Puerto Rican Coordinating Committee Against City-State Budget Cuts, notes that wholesale firing of city employees from key agencies whose principal services affect the poor will adversely hit the Hispanic employee, "who in most cases was the last to be hired, holds a provisional status, and makes a modest income, who will be unable to apply for unemployment insurance and, collectively, will be the man or woman hurt most by being let go in a time of a business slowdown and repressed job market."

The statement points out that the majority of Puerto Ricans in manufacturing jobs earn low pay and are frequently engaged in seasonal work so that at one time or another during the year they are forced to depend on supplemental welfare assistance.

Approximately 40 percent of the 350,000 families on welfare in New York City are Puerto Ricans, and some 700,000 children are involved. The 10-percent cut in welfare payment required by the "soak the poor budget" enacted by the State legislature will tragically affect these children.

Cuts in the city department of social services personnel will have a disastrous effect on the Puerto Ricans in the agency—since they make up most of the case aides and messengers, the jobs which are always the first to be eliminated. Most of these semiskilled assistants who will be dismissed under current city plans are ineligible for unemployment insurance and will have to fall back on welfare assistance while trying to find other jobs.

The Puerto Rican Coordinating Committee points out that "this shuffling of people from one public treasury to another is pointless, time consuming, heart-breaking and, in the long run, far more expensive."

Mr. Speaker, the Puerto Ricans, blacks, and poor people are being especially hard hit by the budget cuts ordered by the State and the current dismissals and cutbacks in city services. They will suffer even more, if the shockingly drastic reduction in city employment and in welfare, health, educational, drug addiction, and other services projected by Mayor Lindsay are allowed to come to pass.

The Puerto Rican community is joining with millions of other New Yorkers in demanding more State aid and tax reform to rescue them from the disaster that New York City's financial plight means for them. It is therefore a very good suggestion that the gentleman makes today in suggesting that there has to be an evaluation and a commitment with regard to real legislation and concern and attention given to the needs of the Puerto Rican population who are here and in Puerto Rico.

In the long run, if the Puerto Rican people on the mainland and in their native land are to survive with dignity

and to have some hope, they will have to have the minimum human rights, which they do not have now, such as adequate employment, shelter, food, clothing, health care, education, and medication.

Again I want to commend the gentleman from Puerto Rico for bringing these proposals before the House. All of us should find the time in our committees and in our deliberations to give very serious consideration to a real Bill of Rights for the Puerto Rican people in this country and in Puerto Rico, which is something we have not done up to today.

Mr. BADILLO. I thank the Congresswoman from New York.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BADILLO. I certainly will.

Mr. HALL. I can certainly understand the gentleman's concern about people who have been displaced from the Commonwealth and brought to the United States. I do not understand all of the statements that he is making about the Commonwealth territory itself. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico has been advised of this special order.

Mr. BADILLO. Oh, yes. He received an advanced text of my speech several days ago.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, my neighboring colleague from New York has spoken with considerable wisdom on a subject that has received far too little attention from this body and this Nation.

The nature of the plight of the Puerto Rican citizen, as Mr. BADILLO has stated throughout his remarks, is one that transcends the bounds of any State or local government. On the island, and on the mainland, citizens of Puerto Rican descent are widespread, and thus the problem demands a Federal remedy, one that cannot much longer be postponed.

Mr. BADILLO's four-point program would be a forthright first move in this direction, and I urge my colleagues on the various committees to adopt the spirit of these proposals.

We must also understand that as no single agency or locality can effectively deal with Puerto Rican problems, no single attitude can be assumed in relation to the Spanish-speaking American populace. They are a diverse and multifaceted group. The questions that arise for the Puerto Rican are often far removed from those that involve the Chicano, or any other Spanish-speaking American, and must be treated as such.

The success of the programs we design will ultimately depend on their ability to deal with the individual: His interests, his concerns, and his human needs, in relation to his background and his environment. Therein lies the strength of Mr. BADILLO's proposals which provide for action in just such a manner.

Mr. BADILLO, as a fellow New Yorker, you know well the efforts currently being made in our city toward establishing bilingual education standards. At this point, what can be said of the merits of those efforts, and how do they fit into the national scope of other programs in other cities with substantial numbers of Spanish-speaking Americans?

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the plight

of the Puerto Rican in this country is an all too familiar subject to anyone who is aware of the larger Spanish-speaking minority's neglected status in the United States. As a member of one segment of this vast Spanish-speaking segment of the population, I have urged for many years that the Federal Government consider the Puerto Rican, the Cuban American, the Mexican American, and other Latin Americans in this country as constituting a single minority. Whereas our national political institutions in the past have preferred to identify the various elements of the Spanish-speaking community as regional problems to be left to the care of the States, the time has come for our Federal officials to view this group as a subject of nationwide concern requiring comprehensive Federal programs.

Certainly no greater evidence of this need for a comprehensive Federal view of the Spanish-speaking minority is required than reference to the fact that both the Puerto Rican and the Mexican American minorities receive both the least education and the poorest paying jobs of any groups in our society with the Puerto Rican averaging less than 5 years of schooling with 70.6 percent of them in low-income occupations and the Mexican American averaging 8 years of education with 76 percent of its men working as manual laborers.

The unique language and cultural barriers confronting both these groups dictate a form of Government assistance which aims at improving the socioeconomic status of this national minority while respecting their unique cultural attributes. In conclusion, I join with my Puerto Rican colleague from New York, Congressman BADILLO, in calling for greater efforts by the Federal Government to alleviate the continuing problems of Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and all other members of the Spanish-speaking population who together comprise the second largest minority in this Nation.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO), for his timely and forthright remarks. He has outlined a comprehensive approach toward a subject of deep and immediate concern to all of us—the need to improve the welfare of the Puerto Rican community here and on the island itself.

My own State of New Jersey possesses a Spanish-speaking community of well over 100,000 people, many of whom live in the greater Newark area. And while we have just begun to fully recognize the depth of the problems facing Puerto Ricans, and have only just begun in a small and hesitating way to programmatically respond, the need to dramatically increase our efforts is shockingly clear. The gentleman from New York has with great clarity and foresight and sense of realism described the nature of Puerto Rican patterns of migration to the mainland United States, and he has coupled that description of economic deprivation with a blueprint for action. Whether the future of Puerto Rico will be best suited by continued commonwealth status or statehood or even independence are questions that should not keep us today

from the task of improving the welfare of these American citizens and I say to the gentleman today that I will be happy to cooperate in every way to assure a better future to our Spanish-speaking community.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days during which to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. TEAGUE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### A CALL FOR CONGRESSIONAL AWARENESS OF THE PROBLEMS OF PUERTO RICO

(Mr. CORDOVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CORDOVA. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I could not be present when the gentleman from New York (Mr. BADILLO), spoke on Puerto Rico today.

I must thank my able colleague from the 21st District of New York for making available to me an advance draft of his remarks, and I am grateful to him for his interest in my constituents. I can assure him I share his interest in his own constituents, those of Puerto Rican origin as well as those who are not.

I subscribe to his call for congressional awareness of the problem of Puerto Rico: The problem of a very densely populated island which is fully integrated into the economy of the Nation, yet has extremely limited natural resources, and of the consequent need for making extensive to Puerto Rico, as fully as possible, all programs designed to meet the problems of disadvantaged areas. Indeed, I hasten to assure him that for over 2 years I have labored assiduously in this direction, as I am certain did the men who preceded me as the elected representative of the citizens of Puerto Rico in Washington, and I have been gratified by the response which has been generally forthcoming from the administration and from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in the other body. But the gentleman from New York, who has a great deal more political experience and astuteness than I, will doubtless recall and agree with the maxim that politics is the art of the possible. Speaking in terms of the family assistance plan, it was not possible to enact it in the 91st Congress, because the two Houses failed to agree on a measure. The enactment of the family assistance plan is extremely important to my constituents in Puerto Rico. But it will not be enacted in the 92d Congress, as it was not enacted in the 91st, unless it has the fullest possible measure of support. It is true that the plan proposed by the administration, and the measures passed by the House and Senate in the 91st Congress, restrict Puerto Rican participation to the proportion borne by our per capita income to that of the least prosperous State. But there is no intent to discrim-

inate against Puerto Rico: It has simply been felt that if welfare benefits were suddenly raised in Puerto Rico to the mainland level, from the present very much lower levels, this might have undesirable social and economic effects. I must say that, while I would like to see our welfare payments in Puerto Rico reach mainland standards, I cannot be certain that the fears of ensuing social and economic disruption are unfounded. What I do know is that this proposed application of the family assistance plan to Puerto Rico on a tailored basis will result in welfare payments of more than double the present amounts. My constituents need this help. The measure supported by the administration, and now before the Ways and Means Committee, would provide them very substantial help. I urge my colleague from New York to support it, and not to reach out for a moon which, as a practical matter, he will not get no matter how eloquently and earnestly he speaks on the floor of the House.

As to my distinguished colleague from New York's second point, that studies be undertaken by the Federal Government and the Government of Puerto Rico looking toward the presentation to Congress of an economic program to bring the standard of living in Puerto Rico to a level comparable to that on the mainland, we in Puerto Rico certainly welcome further studies in this direction, and certainly need no directive from Congress to address ourselves to our problems. And in fairness to those who were in power in Puerto Rico from 1940 to 1968, my political adversaries, I must point out that during that period a program was implemented in Puerto Rico to develop manufacture and promote tourism, and thus provide jobs. This program is in full swing, but has had its occasional setbacks, more often than not in response to economic downswings on the mainland. Yet it has been successful to a marked degree, even if it has not achieved a complete solution of our problem. One of the reasons for the very substantial progress achieved has been the selective application of the Federal minimum wage by industry committees charged with the duty of bringing the minimum wage in Puerto Rico up to the Federal minimum as quickly as possible in each segment of industry without substantial curtailment of employment. We must, indeed, continue to raise wage levels in Puerto Rico, as we have been raising them for years, in order to continue to improve our standard of living. But we must continue to provide jobs for our people, at an increasing pace, hence we must fight to preserve the selective application of the Federal minimum wage to Puerto Rico, under the industry-committee system, and we must object to arbitrary, across-the-board increases, which take no account of the curtailment of employment which may result.

As to the third proposal of the gentleman from New York: Legislation providing programs to help the Puerto Rican communities on the mainland, it has become obvious to me that these communities are in sore need of help in the fields of education, housing, and economic opportunity, hence I commend

the gentleman from New York for calling attention to this very real need.

Turning to the fourth phase of the proposal of the gentleman from New York, the establishment of a program designed to provide job training for unskilled and semiskilled Puerto Ricans to assist them in obtaining jobs on the mainland, I must say it is very clear to us in Puerto Rico that those who have chosen to migrate to the mainland in search of economic opportunities have generally come ill-equipped in skills and language, and we are addressing ourselves in Puerto Rico to the task of improving the quality of our public school education, and particularly the quality of the English language program, which has been quite low. We are also intensifying vocational education, and availing ourselves as fully as possible of existing manpower programs. It is not accurate, however, to credit the Government of Puerto Rico with the development of a program for sending migrant farmworkers to the mainland. As a matter of fact, Puerto Rican workers commenced to be recruited by farmers' organizations on the mainland, and as the practice grew the Government of Puerto Rico decided to step in and regulate it by protective legislation, requiring employment contracts to be approved by the Puerto Rico Labor Department, and to establish offices on the mainland to protect migrant workers. As a result, most of the migrant workers recruited from the mainland are now protected by Government-approved contracts, although a minority still come on their own. But the important point is that migrant farm labor is not a program developed by the Government of Puerto Rico, but by mainland farmers. It is simply regulated by Puerto Rico, to such an extent that every spring I receive inquiries from Members who represent farming communities, and some of whose constituents protest that they are unable to obtain the labor they urgently need because of the interference of Government officials in Puerto Rico who, in one way or another, discourage would-be migrants.

Nevertheless, migration from Puerto Rico is a fact, both in the case of temporary farm labor and in that of the number of people who leave the island on a permanent basis in search of economic opportunity. We welcome all the help we can get from the Federal Government toward the end of providing jobs in Puerto Rico, and of providing those who cannot find jobs there and find it necessary to seek opportunity on the mainland, with the education and skills necessary for them to find and realize on available opportunities.

Fundamentally, as I indicated at the outset, overpopulation is a factor that cannot be ignored in addressing ourselves to the problems of Puerto Rico. Our birthrate has declined sharply from 41.9 per thousand in 1945 to 23.5 in 1968, but our death rate has gone down even more sharply from 13.7 per thousand in 1945 to 5.9 in 1968. In an effort to meet this problem, the present administration has instituted a program for the dissemination of birth-control information. But this is, necessarily, a long-range program.

Meanwhile, we must intensify the effort to create new jobs and to maintain the jobs that now exist. To this end, we invite the help of the distinguished gentleman from New York, and of all the Members of this body.

Mr. Speaker, a pertinent tabulation follows:

VIETNAM ERA VETERANS, SERVICE AFTER AUG. 4, 1964

	Population (millions)	Vietnam era veterans (thousands)
Puerto Rico.....	2.689	43
Connecticut.....	3.032	61
Iowa.....	2.825	58
Kansas.....	2.249	41
South Carolina.....	2.590	41
Kentucky.....	3.219	62
Mississippi.....	2.216	30
Oklahoma.....	2.559	52
Colorado.....	2.207	45
Oregon.....	2.091	50

Source: 1970 Annual Report of the Administrator of Veteran Affairs.

THE STATE OF THE ECONOMY:  
AN ANALYSIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. WHALEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, on November 5, 1968, inflation was one of the more serious problems troubling the voter as he trekked to the polls. Indeed, during the 31 months between October 31, 1965, and October 31, 1968, the cost of living, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, rose at an annual average of 4 percent per year using 1967 as the base year—from 94.9 on October 31, 1965, to 105.7 as of October 31, 1968.

In a speech delivered November 10, 1969, former Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler, candidly acknowledged that this spiral was generated by "a steep advance in Government expenditures, coupled with sharp expansion of business spending on plant and equipment and of personal income, the whole giving rise to an excessively rapid growth of economic activity."

Statistics clearly substantiate Secretary Fowler's conclusions. During the 2 years between July 1, 1966, and June 30, 1968, total Federal outlays increased \$44.1 billion, or 32.7 percent—from \$134.7 billion to \$178.8 billion. Under almost any circumstances a 32.7-percent growth in Government spending in a 24-month period would be inflationary. In addition, the timing and the nature of the 1966-68 increase heightened inflationary pressures.

First, the \$44.1 billion expenditure expansion came at a time when the Nation was operating at optimum plant capacity—90.5 percent utilization. This meant that the demand sparked by increased Federal spending could not be met with existing production facilities. The economy responded to this situation with a significant boost in capital goods purchases. Between December 31, 1965, and December 31, 1968, expenditures by

business for new plant and equipment increased 24.5 percent—from \$54.42 billion to \$67.76 billion.

Second, \$23.7 billion of the aforementioned \$44.1 billion increase in the Federal budget was allocated to military requirements. Defense wares, of course, do not find their way into the Nation's marketplace. Thus, the expanded purchasing power spawned by increased Federal spending during fiscal years 1967 and 1968 was not absorbed by a commensurate growth of merchandise which the consumer could buy. This simply meant, therefore, that more dollars were chasing relatively fewer goods—the classic cause of inflation.

Third, tax receipts failed to match the growth of Federal expenditures during the period July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1968. Consequently, the gross national debt grew from \$264.7 billion to \$290.6 billion. To cover this deficit, the Federal Government extracted \$25.9 billion from the money market. In so doing, it created an acute credit shortage. This contributed to the expansion of the prime interest rate to 5.80 percent in 1968—it had been as low as 4.30 percent in 1964.

Mindful of these facts, Dr. Arthur M. Okun, Chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers, concluded in a 1969 lecture:

Surely, in any meaningful sense, the Federal budget was the engine of the inflation in the period of 1966 to 1968.

On election day, 1968, in choosing a new President, the voters evidently agreed with Dr. Okun's assessment.

II. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE  
NEW ADMINISTRATION

The hangover from an all-night binge is extremely excruciating—at least so I have been told! By the same token, whoever was elected President on November 5, 1968—be he HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, George C. Wallace, or Richard M. Nixon—inevitably would have to face the "hangover" stemming from the economic binge experienced by our country during the previous 36 months.

Dr. Jules Backman, research professor of economics, New York University, described it this way:

Unfortunately, after a period of price inflation which has lasted several years, the choice is not between pleasant and unpleasant policies. Whatever is done will hurt some groups. The question is which is the "least worst" policy, not which is the best policy. The ending of a period of price inflation is always painful. A postponement of the day of judgement only results in an increase in the pain.

So let us not set up false alternatives. Of course we are against unemployment. Of course we are against price inflation. Of course we would like the best of all worlds. But we are not choosing between unemployment and price inflation. That choice is already built into the policies of the past few years. We are choosing among degrees of unemployment now or in the future. We can only hope to limit the price we pay, not to escape it.

Dr. Okun concurred with Professor Backman's views. He observed that if Americans insist on a better price performance we "must" accept some extra unemployment and some sacrifice of output and real income. Unfortunately, we must say: 'Yes, Virginia, there is a trade-

off between employment and price stability."

This, then, was the economic dilemma confronting the new administration as it assumed office on January 20, 1969.

The problem, in fact, was twofold.

First, the second stage of inflation—the cost-push phase which automatically follows demand-pull inflation—already was in evidence. In 1968 output per man hour in the manufacturing sector of our economy grew 4.7 percent. During this same 12-month time frame, however, industrial compensation per man hour increased 7.1 percent. This, in part, accounts for the 3.3 percent growth of unit production costs in 1968. Obviously, during periods of relatively full employment, such as existed in 1968, the producer can pass on his higher costs to his customers in the form of higher prices.

The reason for the large growth in manufacturing wages in 1968 is more easily understood when one examines labor's "real" purchasing power—that is, what the money wage actually buys—as of that time. In December 1965, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, spendable average weekly earnings—in 1967 dollars—of manufacturing employees was \$104.42. Due to the erosive effects of inflation, plus higher taxes, the manufacturing employee's spendable average weekly earnings, as of December 31, 1968, had dropped to \$103.99. This represents a 43-cent decline in "real" buying power over a 3-year period. It was only natural—and completely justifiable—that labor, in negotiating new wage contracts, not only would seek to recuperate this loss in "real" wages but also would bargain for a higher dollar settlement as a hedge against future consumer price acceleration.

Second, the prospect of a slowdown in the Nation's economy had been identified as early as September 5, 1966, by Henry C. Wallich, professor of economics, Yale University. In his Newsweek column of that date Professor Wallich commented:

The further the inflation is allowed to travel, the nastier will be the ultimate crash.

In fact, by January 20, 1969, the seeds of an economic downturn already had been planted.

What were they?

#### A. FISCAL POLICY

On June 28, 1968, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. This legislation imposed a 10-percent surtax on individuals and corporations and restricted fiscal year 1969 expenditures to \$180.1 billion. This resulted in a \$28.1 billion "about face," shifting the Federal budget from a \$25 billion deficit in fiscal year 1968 to a \$3.1 billion surplus for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. With the stroke of the Presidential pen, our fiscal posture abruptly changed from stimulation to restraint.

#### B. MONETARY POLICY

By the time the new administration assumed office the Federal Reserve System already had begun its policy of monetary restraint which it then pursued throughout most of 1969. For example, in December 1968, this independent body's 12 district banks raised their dis-

count rate—interest charged commercial member banks—from 5¼ percent to 5½ percent. The discount rate was boosted to 6 percent in April 1969. In the same month the cash reserve requirement for commercial banks in major financial centers was increased from 16½ to 17 percent of deposits. The Nation's money supply—circulating currency and demand deposits—this became frozen at approximately \$200 billion throughout most of 1969 as a result of these, and other Federal Reserve policies. The Federal Reserve Board of Governors, in an effort to stem inflation, in effect challenged the economy to do more business in 1969 with the same amount of money.

#### C. OPERATION OF THE MARKETPLACE

Perhaps the most significant portent of things to come was the diminution of consumer buying power resulting from the 1966-68 demand-pull inflation. Every high school student remembers the role of price in a market economy—as prices go up, demand declines. Admittedly, supply-demand-price relationships do not operate perfectly in the United States due to the built-in rigidities in our economy. However, the law of supply and demand has not been completely repealed. In the long run, price, in fact, does affect supply-demand decisions. Consequently, as prices rose in 1966, 1967, and 1968, certain segments of our society suffered. For instance, those living on fixed incomes—such as pension recipients—witnessed a 12-percent decline in their buying power between December 31, 1965, and December 31, 1968. Employees of firms operating in a highly competitive environment, during these same years, saw their ability to buy gradually dissipated. Their employers simply were unable to offset any cost increases by raising their prices; hence, wages lagged. Finally, as noted previously, real factory wages declined 43 cents per week over a 36-month period.

What lesson can be drawn from this? When the consumer suffers a reduction in his purchasing power, there eventually follows a decline in the production of the items which he buys.

#### III. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—1969-70

How did the new administration propose to handle the twin problems—cost-push pressures and an incipient economic downturn—with which it was confronted?

Herbert Stein, member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, described the strategy, or "game plan," in a September 22, 1970, address to the Citizens Research Council of Michigan. Dr. Stein indicated that the administration's objective has been "to curb inflation without causing a recession and to do this by first steadily slowing and then steadily reviving the growth of demand."

While some have criticized this "gradual" approach, it was stoutly defended by Professor Okun, Chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers. Dr. Okun, on November 10, 1969, told participants of the New York University School of Commerce's Moskowitz Lecture Series:

Even though the gradualist strategy has tested our faith and our patience at times,

it has been a valuable investment. And I believe that the message is finally getting through that the U.S. Government puts equal weight on the two parts of the gradual disinflation formula.

If the new administration has erred, it was not in the execution of its strategy. Rather, it was in implying in public statements that disinflation could be achieved at no cost. In so doing, the previously cited admonitions of Professor Backman, Dr. Okun, and other economists were ignored.

The inauguration of a new President does not automatically erase adverse conditions bred during previous years. The new administration, therefore, during 1969 and 1970, could not escape paying the "price" which inevitably would be exacted by 1966-68's "demand-pull" inflation.

What was this "price?"

First, understandably, efforts of labor to catch up with lost buying power continued. As a consequence, average factory compensation per man hour in 1969 rose 6.4 percent, contrasted with a 2.1 percent expansion of worker productivity; 1970 saw the same pattern. Industrial wages were boosted 6.7 percent; productivity increased 1.2 percent. This led to a 5.5-percent cost-of-living advance in 1970—using 1957-59 prices as 100, the Consumer Price Index rose from 131.3 on December 31, 1969, to 138.5 on December 31, 1970.

Second, the seeds of an economic downturn—sown in 1966, 1967, and 1968—began to bear fruit. Reduced consumer purchasing power, coupled with the fiscal and monetary restraint commenced in 1968, culminated in a decline in output in 1970. The Industrial Production Index dropped in 8 of 12 months last year. Production, overall, fell 4.2 percent in 1970—from 171.1 percent of the 1957-59 average on December 31, 1969, to 164.0 percent on December 31, 1970.

As a result, gross national product, which measures the economy's total output of goods and services, dropped \$2.8 billion in 1970—using 1958 "constant" dollars to iron out the effects of inflation. The number of jobless in December 1970, mounted to 6.2 percent of the civilian labor force. This figure, incidentally, was influenced by the previous fall's General Motors strike.

In humanistic terms, any unemployment is undesirable. Nevertheless, the 1969-70 record represents a marked improvement when contrasted with the "cost" or "price" of previous postinflationary downturns. For example, World War II's inflation inspired a recession during the late 1940's. Unemployment reached 6.8 percent in August 1949—October's 7.9 percent is discarded because of the effect of a nationwide steel strike. The jobless figure remained at 6.5 percent as late as January 1950. The aftermath of the Korean war's "demand-pull" inflation created an unemployment level of 6.1 percent in September 1954. Between 1958 and 1960 the economy suffered from a further recession, this time occasioned by post-Korean "cost-push" inflation. Unemployment during this period rose to 7.5 percent in July 1958,

and a 1960 high of 6.6 percent in December of that year.

Indeed, 1970's unemployment statistics compare favorably with those recorded during the economic revival of 1961-64. The percentage of the Nation's labor force which was unemployed in May 1961, stood at 7.1 percent; 5.8 percent in January 1962; 5.9 percent in February 1963; and 5.6 percent in January 1964. In fact, unemployment finally fell below 5 percent only when our military involvement in Vietnam accelerated.

#### IV. THE ECONOMY TODAY

Has the "hangover," occasioned by the economic binge of 1966-68, been brought under control? Have we begun the transition from the "price-paying" process, described by Professors Backmun and Okun, toward a realization of the administration's goal of "curbed inflation and revived demand?" Paul Samuelson, MIT professor and Nobel laureate in economics, answers these questions affirmatively. Addressing an April 22, 1971, luncheon meeting of the Woman's National Democratic Club, Professor Samuelson noted that during the first quarter of this year the economy achieved "genuine improvement." He predicted:

The year 1971 is going to be much better than 1970.

Recent economic indicators support the Nobel laureate's conclusions.

First, significant progress has been made in bringing prices under control. The cost of living, computed on an annual basis, rose only 2.7 percent between December 31, 1970, and March 31, 1971. This represents the smallest quarterly rise in the Consumer Price Index—from 119.1 on December 31, 1970, to 119.8 on March 31, 1971—in 4 years.

Interest rates likewise have declined. The prime rate hit 8 percent during the first quarter of 1970. Twelve months later commercial banks were charging their lowest-risk borrowers only 5¼ percent—the prime rate moved up to 5½ percent on April 23, 1971.

Second, output soared during the period January 1 to March 31, 1971. The Industrial Production Index moved from 104—1967 base year—as of December 31, 1970, to 104.5 on March 31, 1971. This represents an annual advance of 1.92 percent. Accordingly, during the first quarter the total value of goods and services increased \$28.5 billion, the largest dollar expansion in history. Eliminating the inflationary bias, "real" growth of the gross national product was 6.5 percent, the highest quarterly gain since April to June, 1968.

The first quarter's gross national product results should be tempered by the fact that a portion of the total can be attributed to the resumption of automobile production following last fall's strike—September 14 to December 20. Nevertheless, as noted in the business outlook section of the April 24, 1971, issue of Business Week:

Most impressive was the significant increase in final demand. GNP minus inventory changes rose by a hefty \$30 billion. This is setting the stage for more solid industrial gains.

#### V. THE FUTURE

How will the economy perform during the remainder of the year?

##### A. INFLATION

###### 1. PRICES

The combination of 6-percent unemployment, 72.3-percent plant utilization—as of the fourth quarter, 1970—and a 5.3-percent first-quarter productivity increase should more than offset the pressures generated by increased wage demands.

The First National City Bank of New York, in its January 1971, Monthly Economic Letter points out that during the 1958 recession, 12 months of high unemployment elapsed before the rapid increase in the cost-of-living index was halted:

But over the next 12-month period—

The Monthly Economic Letter continues—

the number of unemployed fell by 1.4 million while the rate of increase in consumer prices slowed to a virtual halt.

Thus, First National City Bank officials conclude that—

In 1971 there are good prospects that the rate of inflation will decelerate significantly as the full effects of the 1970 slowdown in economic activity work through to the price indexes.

###### 2. INTEREST RATES

According to the April 23, 1971, issue of U.S. Financial Data, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, the Nation's money supply during the past 4 months "has increased at a 10.3 percent compounded annual rate." Loan growth, on the other hand, "has not accelerated in the past 4 months compared to the previous 5." These factors account for the expansion of member bank reserves from their recent low of \$27.5 billion on May 27, 1970, to \$30.8 billion on April 21, 1971. This growing availability of bank funds should insure that long-term interest rates will remain substantially below their 1969-70 levels.

##### B. OUTPUT-UNEMPLOYMENT

Any further gains are contingent upon the performance of two important segments of our economy—the businessman and the consumer. What is the likelihood of business firms expanding their investment in capital goods? Will the consumer, during the remainder of 1971, abandon his caution and significantly increase his level of spending?

###### 1. CAPITAL INVESTMENT

Economists often refer to the "multiplier effect" exercised by increased purchases of capital goods—buildings, machinery, and equipment. By this is meant that every new dollar invested in capital goods is respent several times within the economy. An increase in capital investment, therefore, is essential if, in 1971, unemployment is to be reduced and new entries into the labor force are to be absorbed.

According to a recent Associated Press dispatch, McGraw-Hill's annual survey of business' plans for new plant and equipment reveals that—

U.S. businesses plan a four percent increase in capital investment in 1971.

This represents an improvement over preliminary estimates released last fall by McGraw-Hill. At that time, due to excess plant capacity—72.3 percent utilization during the fourth quarter, 1970—only a 2-percent rise in capital expenditures was envisioned. This doubling of capital investment intentions between last fall and this spring, according to McGraw-Hill's chief economist, Douglas Greenwald, stems from the need for plant modernization and the anticipation of a 7-percent rise in the dollar value of manufacturing sales in 1971.

Even more encouraging is the McGraw-Hill finding that business' preliminary projections reflect a rising level of capital spending in 1972, 1973, and 1974. According to Mr. Greenwald, this investment expansion is predicated upon an expected 22-percent increase in the dollar value of sales by the end of 1974. If this level of capital spending materializes, it is anticipated that total manufacturing employment, by the end of 1974, will grow 11 percent.

###### 2. CONSUMER SPENDING

In the final analysis, purchases of capital equipment by business firms are determined by what the consumer does or does not do. Recent indices manifest a greater willingness on the part of the individual citizen to part with his earnings and savings. During March, for instance, private housing starts reached a 1,918,000 annual rate—contrasted with the 1,433,000 units constructed in 1970; 450,626 automobiles were sold during the first 20 days of April. This is 12.5 percent above the figure for the comparable period in 1970. As reported by Thomas Mulaney of the New York Times:

Total retail sales around the country in the week ended April 10 (just prior to Easter) were up 14 percent.

Despite this acceleration of consumer demand, the average American still saved 7.2 percent of his take-home pay—disposable income—during the first 3 months of 1971, an abnormally high rate. If the consumer continues to regain his confidence and reverts to his more normal 6 percent savings—of disposable income—pattern, he will spark a rapid economic expansion during the balance of 1971.

###### VI. CONCLUSION

One rose does not make a summer. Similarly, 3 months do not make a year—or 4 years. Consequently, as recommended by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York in its April, 1971, Morgan Guaranty Survey, one should use "caution" in interpreting recent economic data. Yet recent indicators have led First National City Bank of New York economists to conclude—in the April, 1971, Monthly Economic Letter:

Considering the relative mildness of the recession, the strength of the revival is, in fact, impressive . . . the current business upswing has started along the kind of path that has led to vigorous economic recovery in the past, and there is every reason to believe that it will continue on that path. This key fact can be seen in any number of ways.

Thus, evidence accumulates that the economy is in transition. It clearly is moving from the painful "price" exacted

by 1966-68's "demand-pull" inflation toward the dual goal of "curbed inflation and revived demand." It is this fact which prompted Professor Samuelson, during his April 22 speech, to remark that next year when the man in the street enters the election booth, he "will know that in November 1972, he is better off."

#### MINORITY LEADER'S ATTACK ON SENATOR MUSKIE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. KYROS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to discuss certain comments that were made by the House minority leader last week, on April 29, at the American-Israeli public affairs luncheon held here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, at that time the gentleman from Michigan made certain remarks about a great American, a great Senator and an outstanding Democrat, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, which need to be put in perspective, particularly because many House Members have indicated their intention to discuss those remarks in full.

In substance, those remarks were erroneous and, apparently, the gentleman from Michigan was misinformed both as to Senator MUSKIE's statements to Soviet leaders and his general policy regarding the Middle East. In addition, it is my feeling that the discussion of foreign policy as it deals with Southeast Asia, and now particularly with the Middle East, should be devoid of all partisanship.

Certainly an area in which the United States is vitally interested, in which we even today, through our Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers, are attempting to achieve some kind of stability and some kind of a rational peace, requires the unified support of people all over this country to insure that that policy can be maintained.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYROS. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman in the well for taking this time to put into proper perspective the remarks of the minority leader last week on the 23d anniversary of Israel's independence, held here at the Rayburn Building.

I was at that luncheon and I also heard the remarks. The remarks were in bad taste. This was a solemn occasion marking the 23d anniversary of Israel's independence and hardly the place for a partisan attack on a Member of the Senate. I was deeply concerned that the remarks made were very obviously designed to carry out orders from the White House to stop MUSKIE. It is very apparent the White House high command has decreed that MUSKIE is the man they have got to beat, otherwise he is going to beat them in 1972. MUSKIE has the support, the quality, and the

stature, but more importantly, the understanding of the difficult problems confronting both our country and the world. It is for this reason that the White House strategy is to stop MUSKIE at all cost. It is obvious all the top guns of the Republican leadership have been given orders to "get MUSKIE before he gets us."

Mr. Speaker, the minority leader followed an old, old political tactic: When you cannot say anything good about your own position, then try to discredit your opposition; find a scapegoat. While the minority leader did not name the particular Senator by name, it was obvious that he was indeed talking about the Senator from Maine. The minority leader had to take off against MUSKIE because he could not very well defend this administration's position in the Middle East.

This administration has suggested that we make the Soviet Union a member of the permanent peacekeeping force in the Middle East. That is like having the fox watch the chicken coop. We should be trying to get the Soviets out of the Middle East instead of legalizing the presence of their troops in this troubled area. This administration has not been able to understand Soviet presence in the Middle East; Soviet imperialism. If this were a problem to be resolved between the Arab States and Israel, the problem would be solved tomorrow, but it is the intransigence of the Soviet Union that makes a solution to the Middle East situation impossible.

So, when we have an administration that encourages and recommends that we make the Soviet Union a member of the permanent peacekeeping force, obviously this administration wants to deliver the Middle East and Israel to Soviet influence and domination; a cordon sanitaire of pro-Soviet states in the Middle East.

Nor could the minority leader defend the other concept of this administration's lack of understanding of the problems in the Middle East, namely opening the Suez Canal with no guarantees to Israel. Right now Secretary of State Rogers is in the Middle East. He is trying to get the Suez Canal opened. Who wants it opened most? The Soviet Union wants it open, because they want to be able to move their fleet out of the Mediterranean into the Indian Ocean and to continue their conspiracies and intrigues into that part of the world. Israel has insisted on territorial guarantees before she will agree to open it up; guarantees that Egyptian troops will not cross the Suez. Israel has a right to make such demands, but there is no evidence that Secretary Rogers agrees with Israel's problems.

Finally, the distinguished minority leader made some pronouncement about what the Senator from Maine had told Kosygin in a recent conversation in Moscow.

I think we ought to be very grateful to Mr. Jack Anderson for his column, "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," which appeared in the Washington Post today. Mr. Anderson had obtained a copy of a secret memorandum that had been prepared by the State Department for

the top leaders of the administration on what Senator MUSKIE did tell Kosygin and Gromyko during the Moscow conference.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that the entire column be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of all our remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Anderson's column discloses a secret memorandum prepared by the State Department on what Senator MUSKIE actually told the Soviet leader. I have no reason to doubt that Mr. Anderson is stating the case correctly, because Mr. Anderson has wide resources in this Capitol.

Mr. Anderson, in quoting from the secret document, says that Senator MUSKIE told Mr. Kosygin and Mr. Gromyko in no uncertain terms:

"Acting as if Israel does not have a security problem is not going to allow a settlement." It is necessary to deal with both Arab desire to recover territories and Israeli desire for security. . . .

The secret memorandum states further:

There was extended discussion of Israeli view of security with Muskie expressing understanding for Israeli feeling about Golan Heights. "This is not a question of logic."

In defending Israel's right to the territories she captured in the 6-day war, the memorandum says Senator MUSKIE: "distinguished between acquisition of territory in war and rectifications of borders in areas sensitive to security of one or another state."

It is quite clear that Senator MUSKIE had made a very strong and persuasive case before Kosygin and Gromyko in Moscow that Israel is entitled to retention of Golan Heights, and needs these borders in order to have a method of defending herself, and that there can be no peace in the Middle East until the Soviet Union and the Arab States realize that Israel must have these defensive boundaries.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that it comes in bad grace for anyone today to try and create the impression at an Israeli luncheon honoring the 23d anniversary of Israel that somehow or other Senator MUSKIE is insensitive to the needs of the Israelis.

I am glad the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS), has taken this time to put into perspective what it is that Senator MUSKIE said in Moscow and as to his strong position and understanding of the Middle East. I hope we will hear no more of this distortion from the distinguished minority leader. Of course, when we listen to the minority leader attack Senator MUSKIE and then we listen to Senator DOLE, the Chairman of the Republican National Committee on television Sunday attack Senator MUSKIE, we see the pattern unfold; all of the big Republican guns are centering on ED MUSKIE. It becomes very clear and obvious to this Member: MUSKIE is the man to stop—but I do not believe they will succeed.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my good friend from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), for his remarks. And I

truly believe, as the gentleman does, that this issue should not have been brought into partisan politics at all. Our attitude toward the Middle East should remain bipartisan, because the United States' position is one of self interest, and the survival and security of Israel is unquestionably in that interest. It is my sincere belief that the interest of Israel and other nations will best be served by keeping this out of politics entirely.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYROS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HAYS).

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to observe that it looks to me like the administration is working both sides of the street. The Secretary of State apparently speaks to the Arabs on the administration's policy toward the Arabs, and apparently the minority leader is trying to kid the Israelis about the administration's policy toward Israel. But I really do not think his remarks were aimed at Israel or Israeli assumptions, I think his remarks were aimed at the Jewish population in the United States, hoping that somehow or other he can talk and double-talk his way into having them believe somehow or other that Mr. MUSKIE is antagonistic toward Israel. The fact is that I have known Jewish people all my life, and if the minority leader does not know it I can tip him off that they are too smart to swallow that. About the only thing he is going to do is to insure that they are not going to vote for any Republicans in the next election, along with an awful lot of other people.

Mr. KYROS. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his remarks.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYROS. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the gentleman in the well for taking time to bring this issue into the public forum. It was a distinct displeasure last week to listen to the minority leader of this House as he launched on what really were some very blatant and irresponsible misrepresentations directed against Senator MUSKIE.

Like the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), a lot of us were invited to the luncheon of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee to honor the 23d anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel; unlike the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD), every other speaker there refrained from using the occasion for partisan political purposes.

As a member of the audience to which the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) spoke, and as a loyal supporter of the commitment that this country made a long time ago toward defending Israel's right to survive, I, for one, resented the cynical use of half truths and mistruths that the minority leader exercised toward the distinguished Senator from Maine. The minority leader seemed to believe, as my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio just stated, that an entire group of potential voters can somehow be influenced to support one candidate or oppose another on the minority leader's say-so. I think he is

going to have a very rude shock in 1972.

Senator MUSKIE has been a longtime friend of Israel and a supporter of America's commitment to Israel's security. He needs no defense from me or anybody else on that score.

At the same time he has been the voice of sanity calling for increased understanding with the Soviet Union on winding down the arms race in order that we might devote more of our vast resources to the crying human needs at home and abroad.

I am glad that my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI), is going to insert in the RECORD the entire column by Mr. Anderson that appeared in this morning's Washington Post. I think it makes very clear that Senator MUSKIE in his conversation with Mr. Kosygin was not bartering Israel's survival for any points in his debate, but rather was urging the Russians to do something that he has consistently done, and that is to talk seriously about deescalating the tremendous arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States.

I emphatically resent the minority leader's misrepresentation of Senator MUSKIE's position on these crucial issues; it is a calculated, cynical example of partisan politicking of the worst variety.

I think it grossly diminishes what heretofore has been a bipartisan and apolitical expression of support for Israel's right to survival, a right which Senator MUSKIE has vigorously defended.

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my most able colleague, the gentleman from Illinois. From my experience here I would say that he is exceedingly knowledgeable and capable of understanding the problems of the Middle East. He has often expressed his views on the floor of the House, and is a gentleman to whom many people look when trying to understand the difficult problems in that part of the world. I am delighted to have the gentleman's help in putting this matter in perspective.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYROS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to comment briefly on the remarks made by Mr. FORD. I was present at the time the minority leader made the statements that he did, and I speak now as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Near East Subcommittee. Having just returned from Israel and knowing the high regard that the people of Israel hold for Senator MUSKIE, I want to communicate that to the Members of the House and to repudiate the statements made by the minority leader. I am sorry to see a question with such serious implications being injected into this very tragic situation that exists in the Middle East. Politics really have no place in an area where we are trying to smother the flames that could engulf the entire world. I feel that it is important that the minority leader be informed as to the true nature not only of Mr. MUSKIE's feelings, but also of the statement that he has made. I personally have had experience talking to Mr. MUSKIE about the Middle East and can vouch

for his strong convictions and support for Israel—not for the Jewish vote, but because of the fact he feels, as I have understood Mr. FORD has stated in past remarks, that we must support Israel because, to put it in Mr. FORD's words, the security of the United States is tied to Israel and Israel's security is tied to the United States.

I think it is in the U.S. interest that Mr. MUSKIE speaks in support of Israel. The distortion that has occurred as a result of remarks in debate by Mr. FORD are also indicative of the fact that a great amount of misinformation pervades our debates today, and I appreciate the fact that you are standing there and providing us with the opportunity of setting the record straight.

Mr. KYROS. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York. I must say again, with regard to the Middle East crisis as well as to Southeast Asia, that I know the gentleman has made many trips there, and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has contributed greatly to the understanding of people like myself, as a result of his knowledge of those areas. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KYROS. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of this discussion some pertinent excerpts of what Senator MUSKIE has said about Israel on a number of occasions.

On the David Frost Show on March 31, 1971, Senator MUSKIE said:

The local security situation below the Golan Heights, on the Syrian border; the Sharm El-Sheikh situation which, you know, controls the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, over which the Six Day War began in 1967, the very narrow waist of Israel on the West Bank of the Jordan—these are three local security problems that Israel has every right to be concerned about. And she's trying to pursue them the best she can in a tactical situation which is very difficult.

In his speech at Palm Beach, Fla., on February 18, 1971, Senator MUSKIE said, among other things:

Every nation has to be concerned with its security interests and Israel must be as well . . .

In a speech at Cleveland, Ohio, on February 10, 1971, the Senator said:

Israel's neighbors must recognize that Israel is here to stay. They must recognize—and so must others—that the United States is and will remain committed to Israel's security. That is what I told the students at Hebrew University I would say when I went to Cairo, and that is what I did say, both in Cairo and in Moscow.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the record is very clear on the position that Senator MUSKIE has taken on the issue of aid to Israel. For the minority leader to try to distort that position in a speech before 400 very distinguished Members of the Congress and members of the Jewish community is, as the gentleman from Maine said, to try to bring this issue into a bipartisan forum at a time when we ought to be standing together. Our Na-

tion for 23 years has been committed under four different Presidents to the principle that Israel is here to stay, and nobody is going to drive Israel into the sea. I believe the distinguished Senator from Maine, Senator MUSKIE, has taken that position and has stated it as eloquently and as unequivocally as anything that I might say on this floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia). Without objection, the various excerpts adverted to by the gentleman from Illinois will be included in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. KYROS. I thank the Speaker, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his eloquent remarks concerning Senator MUSKIE's position on Israel. I would suggest that in the light of our discussion of the minority leader's remarks, and in view of the fact that we now have provided sufficient information for him to correct those remarks, that he no longer can be dismayed at what he thought was Senator MUSKIE's position and intent. I believe that the minority leader's remarks were indeed unfortunate—not only as regards a great U.S. Senator, but also as regards a foreign policy which we would all like to be behind in the Middle East. I think the minority leader's remarks were unfortunate in the face of our Nation's fine attempts to achieve a military balance and stability in that area of the world.

Above all, I would call the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that Senator MUSKIE attempted to restate to Premier Kosygin that many Americans today are concerned about the high cost of military spending, and that both the Soviet Union and America mutually would benefit if the cost of such spending in each of our countries were diverted to domestic needs. This is a view which Senator MUSKIE has expressed often and publicly in recent years.

Senator MUSKIE did not explicitly or by any implication suggest that this lessens in any way America's pledge to Israel's security. On the contrary, the Senator has been most emphatic in conveying both to Soviet and to Egyptian leaders his support of the American commitment to Israel's security.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing their dismay at the actions of the Republican minority floor leader in his purely partisan attack on Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE of Maine, before the meeting of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee last Thursday.

This was a bipartisan meeting to which Members of the Congress were invited. The theme of the meeting was the 23d anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel. It was a time to recognize the accomplishments of Israel and to honor this country which is deeply admired by so many of us. The meeting was not for the purpose of making an unfounded, irresponsible partisan attack on a Member of the opposite party.

As the charges were patently misleading, I would like to include for the RECORD what Senator MUSKIE has said

publicly concerning Israel, not what the minority leader said he said.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add my voice to those who have spoken out against the irresponsible and improper remarks by the House minority leader at the luncheon meeting of the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee on April 29. While I am very concerned about the inaccuracy of Mr. Ford's statements, I am equally concerned about the impropriety of issuing such a callous political "cheap-shot" at what was without doubt a nonpartisan meeting. The luncheon was arranged by the leadership of both parties and a most distinguished group of leaders of the American Jewish community as well as the Israel Ambassador were present. The remarks of the minority leader were a great source of embarrassment to the organizers of the meeting and the Ambassador was made especially uncomfortable.

Senator MUSKIE is a friend of Israel and a great humanitarian. I can understand the minority leader's desire to discredit a leading contender for the Democratic presidential nomination, but this time Mr. Ford only discredited himself. The Senator's conversations with Soviet leaders centered on the need to limit the arms race and in no way reflected any desire to weaken Israel's security. Senator MUSKIE should be commended for his sincere efforts to lessen the dangers of a world conflagration. The strategy of those who oppose an arms limitation is evidently to sound the alarm that our friends' defensive capabilities will be weakened by any such limitation and then to appeal to interest groups in the United States that have a special affinity or affection for a particular friendly nation. This is a sad commentary on both the policies and politics of the GOP.

I hope that the minority leader will take the time to reassess his own position on arms limitations and will extend a most necessary apology to the junior Senator from Maine.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great reluctance that I add my voice on this matter. I hold the minority leader in high personal regard as one who normally places the public interest above any other consideration.

But the gentleman's remarks at last week's luncheon cannot be explained away as an excess of spontaneity. They followed the lines of a prepared press release, appearing to be part of a carefully orchestrated partisan attack on a front-running Democratic leader. If I have any nose for these things, the gentleman's speech was written in executive offices of the White House.

Had the subject been economic trends, the environment, or even ping-pong, Senator MUSKIE would have been fair game. He is entitled to no special protection against harsh partisan attack—even for the kind that Mr. Nixon likes to call "a cheap shot." But the delicate balance of peace in the Middle East, Mr. Speaker, is no subject for such byplay.

We all yearn for stability in that troubled area—in approaching this goal,

let us cast aside the vestiges of disruptive and totally unnecessary partisanship.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Maine, Mr. KYROS, in opposing the use of half-truths in maligning Senator MUSKIE's position on foreign policy.

I must admit that I am struck by the fact that in defense of bipartisanship in foreign policy, the minority leader has leveled an absolutely partisan attack. More important, however, is the fact that this is certainly not the time in American history to create discord where none need exist. There will certainly be many opportunities over the course of the next year and a half for Democrats and Republicans to have honest differences of opinion. Those differences serve to make both the two-party system and America, itself, strong. There is no need, however, for differences to be fashioned from half-truths and I am proud to be associated with my colleague from Maine in combating it.

(The material referred to by Mr. PUCINSKI is as follows:)

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1971]

KOSYGIN HARSH WITH MUSKIE ON MIDEAST  
(By Jack Anderson)

A hush-hush reporter to the State Department on Senator Ed Muskie's recent conversations with Soviet leaders reveals, ominously, that Premier Alexei Kosygin spoke "in uncompromising harsh terms" about the Middle East.

A U.S. embassy interpreter, Sol Polansky, accompanied Muskie to the Kremlin with the understanding that his notes would belong to the senator, not to the State Department.

Later, however, the State Department demanded a full report on the talks. Despite Ambassador Jacob Beam's agreement to respect Muskie's rights to his own confidential conversations, the embassy obediently submitted a detailed summary intended for the eyes only of top administration officials.

We have been shown a copy of the summary, which gives the highlights of Muskie's four-hour meeting with Premier Kosygin and earlier visit with Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko.

"Kosygin," states the summary, "appeared sober, attentive throughout, with some iciness showing through when talking about Jewish problem and heat when talking about Vietnam, and in general was conspicuously more doctrinaire and polemical than Gromyko."

When the conversation got around to the Middle East, Muskie stressed "that no area had more potential for destroying any constructive U.S.-Soviet relationship, that it has poisoned the atmosphere on both sides, and resolution of this problem will help eliminate others."

"Kosygin replied in uncompromising harsh terms, charging specifically that:

"A. Israel is settling people on seized Arab territories.

"B. U.S. did not call for settling Arab-Israeli conflict by peaceful means but supported aggression—another example, he said, where U.S. takes position 'on other side of barricade from SU' where major problem is involved.

"C. Israel is like gangster who in U.S. (where there can be large-scale gangster problem) might seize your house and demand that you negotiate with him for its return.

"D. Rejoicing in USG (U.S. government) circles over Israel's victory surprised U.S.S.R. since 200 million Arabs will never be reconciled to loss of territory, and this has become inflammatory factor in the situation.

"E. Arabs will remember U.S. policy and this will not create confidence but rather will build tension by implication between Arabs and U.S."

Kosygin added "that U.S.S.R. had said all along that Israel must exist as independent state but must give up occupied territories. U.S.S.R. was acting in accordance with the relevant SC (United Nations Security Council) resolution.

"Muskie replied that the situation is not black and white as Kosygin described it. It is a question of what is really security.

"Acting as if Israel does not have a security problem is not going to allow a settlement." It is necessary to deal with both Arab desire to recover territories and Israeli desire for security," Muskie said.

#### MUSKIE, GROMYKO ARGUE

Earlier, Muskie reported to Gromyko on his talks with both Israel and Egyptian officials. The summary quotes Muskie as saying: "While neither side wishes the resumption of hostilities, except as a last resort, their respective positions on territory make the possibility of settlement discouraging. . . .

"Gromyko questioned Israel's view that it can gain security by clinging to occupied territory. . . . It seems to us that when offered peace and effective guarantees, Israel runs away."

"There was extended discussion of Israeli view of security with Muskie expressing understanding for Israeli feeling about Golan Heights. This is not question of logic."

"Gromyko argued against need for even minor rectifications, saying that U.S.S.R. would have answered similar withdrawal offer from Nazi Germany with massed artillery salvos.

"Muskie replied that he distinguished between acquisition of territory in war and rectifications of borders in areas sensitive to security of one or another state. He cited examples of Soviet borders with Finland and Poland and the Oder-Neisse border. He also recalled that it was only after the Six Day War that U.A.R. (Egypt) was ready to concede Israel's right of passage through Suez and right to exist.

"Gromyko argued, in turn, that U.S. position on what is necessary to achieve a settlement has continued to expand since 1967, and he referred to international convention which states that U.A.R. has sovereignty over canal, and if U.A.R. agrees to Israeli passage, it should be considered a goodwill gesture of peace.

"Gromyko also asserted that U.S. could exert 'sobering influence' on Israel to get it to agree to peaceful settlement."

Footnote: The unauthorized embassy summary, incidentally, completely contradicts House GOP leader Gerald Ford's recent attack upon Muskie. Ford gave a distorted account of what Muskie had told Kosygin, although the GOP high command had a complete report of the conversation. Apparently, Ford hoped his attack would keep wealthy Jews from contributing to Muskie's presidential campaign.

#### EXCERPT OF STATEMENTS MADE BY SENATOR MUSKIE ON THE SUBJECT OF ISRAEL: DAVID FROST SHOW, MARCH 31, 1971

FROST. How about that other flashpoint of trouble, the Middle East. Currently, with the Egyptian Premier, President, apparently making some concession, the onus, and a lot of opinions coming out of Washington, seems to be that at the moment, it's Israel who's being too unyielding. That seems to be the general view that's emerging at the moment. Is it one you could go along with?

MUSKIE. Well, that's a tactical judgment which is difficult to make without knowing what is being said privately, as well as publicly, by both sides. Israel has very real security problems. They cannot be solved, I don't think, wholly by guarantees, whether

they're four power guarantees, or two power guarantees.

The local security situation below the Golan Heights, on the Syrian border; the Sharm El-Sheikh situation which, you know, controls the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, over which the Six Day War began in 1967, the very narrow waist of Israel on the West Bank of the Jordan—these are three local security problems that Israel has every right to be concerned about. And she's trying to pursue them the best she can in a tactical situation which is very difficult. And so I'm not going to try to second guess the tactical moves from the sidelines. But I think that all the countries involved ought to understand, and in a realistic way, Israel's security problems in this connection.

#### SENATOR MUSKIE'S REMARKS; SPEECH AT PALM BEACH, FLA., FEB. 18, 1971

Then I went to Moscow. You have read more about that than you have about the others. But I had three hours with Mr. Gromyko and almost four with Mr. Kosygin. We discussed many things.

But having come out of the Middle East with these strong impressions that I just described so briefly, I felt that there was one point above all that I must make to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union up to that point, and indeed, up to this point, has indicated complete, one hundred percent support of the Egyptian position, with respect to withdrawal from territories. And, I felt it was important to emphasize Israel's case for secure and recognized borders. And I was able to do so from my first-hand exposure.

Most of my time with Mr. Gromyko was spent in discussing and debating this question. I also went into it with Mr. Kosygin, not in such details, because I had already covered it with the foreign minister. But both the Egyptians and the Russians tend to cast this question of borders in the context of the principal of withdrawal from conquered territories which is part of the Security Council's resolution. So finally I used an historical precedent to drive the point home to Mr. Gromyko. I said, "What the Israelis are talking about as essential to their national security is a rectification of borders, related to their security needs." And, I said, "Mr. Foreign Minister, you Russians understand what is meant by rectification of borders. You had a little something of it at the end of the Finnish War in 1940. You had a little something more of it along the Polish border, at the end of World War II. Every nation has to be concerned with its security interests and Israel must be as well. . . ."

#### SENATOR MUSKIE'S REMARKS AT CLEVELAND, OHIO, FEB. 10, 1971

Israel's neighbors must recognize that Israel is here to stay. They must recognize—and so must others—that the United States is and will remain committed to Israel's security. That is what I told the students at Hebrew University I would say when I went to Cairo, and that is what I did say, both in Cairo and in Moscow.

#### ISSUES AND ANSWERS: FEBRUARY 7, 1971

Mr. GILL, Senator, there has been some confusion by new reports about your talks with Russia's Premier Kosygin. Now you reportedly said during that conversation with Mr. Kosygin that there was a large body of opinion in this country that would favor cuts in military spending. To clear up the confusion about that conversation, can you tell us what you did say to Mr. Kosygin on this point?

SENATOR MUSKIE. First of all I did not say what you have described in your question. I made it clear to Mr. Kosygin as I did to every head of state I met on the trip, that

I was there as an individual Senator, that I was not there in any official capacity, that I did not represent the Administration, that I was not there to criticize the Administration, that I was there to exchange points of view and to express my own in the process.

Now, with respect to the question of armaments, I launched this discussion in terms of the long term. I pointed out that I believed that unless we found a way to reach meaningful agreements with the Soviet Union that what we would see would be an escalation of arms, the commitment of even greater proportions of our material resources to the cost of arms, a diversion of those resources away from the problem of dealing with human needs of our people and those of other people around the globe, and the end result of this kind of movement would be an increased risk of war and the end of life on this planet. And so that in terms of the long-term, I wanted him to understand how urgent was my feeling that the Soviet Union and the United States find some way to stabilize the arms race.

Secondly, I said that because we each had the power to destroy each other, we each understandably feared the ultimate intentions of the other, that that fear and the distrust which it breeds are real problems that we each must deal with and that these fears are exacerbated by such problems as the Middle East problem, the continually-arising problem of Berlin, and others. That in addition there were internal developments from time to time in our countries that raised doubts as to the ultimate intentions of the other, problems such as the treatment of Jewish minorities in the Soviet Union, problems such as the continuing speculation now that hard-liners are taking over in Moscow and the Soviet Union, I mean, this was the frankness with which we discussed developments.

#### REMARKS BY GERALD R. FORD, TO THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, WASHINGTON, D.C. APRIL 29, 1971

(Excerpts taken from page 2 of Ford's release)

"In exercising such caution it is vital that we maintain the great bastion of bi-partisan Congressional support of Israel. Such support strengthens the hand of our President who is committed to a just peace. But I am troubled that some very important Members of the United States Senate are abandoning bi-partisanship on the Middle East and are making statements that facilitate the Soviet Union's anti-Israel pressures.

"I am thinking of one Senator who is seeking our highest national office. Earlier this year he went to the Middle East and then called on Soviet Premier Kosygin in Moscow. He told Kosygin that "there was a strong body of opinion in the United States" opposed to U.S. defense appropriations linked to our foreign commitments including the Middle East.

"I am dismayed that such a well-informed Senator could visit Israel and Egypt where he actually witnessed the ongoing Soviet military build-up and still find it possible to go to Moscow and tell Kosygin that there was disunity between him and President Nixon on U.S. military spending that relates to Israel's security. This was a disservice to Israel's security. It was a disservice to the bipartisan foreign policy objectives of the United States. It tended to undermine the credibility of American deterrence of the growing military involvement against Israel. It undercut the impact of President Nixon's visit to the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean last Autumn when the President served notice on Moscow that we were prepared to defend freedom in the Mediterranean.

"I am dismayed that this Senator could

ignore what the Soviet Union is doing not only in the United Arab Republic but also through its intervention in such places as Ceylon, Sudan and East Pakistan. Russia's MIG's and Russian bombs are killing peasants in those places. But some are too busy denouncing our own nation to notice."

#### INCREASING MARITIME IMPORTANCE OF THE INDIAN OCEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, still another chapter in the Communist pursuit of total sea domination is now being written. Not in the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans, as you might expect, but in an area of completely new maritime importance—the Indian Ocean.

What accounts for this increasing publicity of the Indian Ocean? While vast in size, it is smaller than both the Atlantic and the even larger Pacific Ocean. Still, it encompasses an area of approximately 17 million square miles. Islands in the Indian Ocean which are practically unknown to Western writers are suddenly receiving great attention in the press. Such islands as Ceylon and Madagascar are suddenly figuring in headlines and in commentary. They are important because they have emerged as important communications links and bases.

The Indian Ocean washes the shores of three continents—Africa, Asia, and Australia. Continents, especially in the first two cases, upon which the Communists are seeking a dominant role in world influence.

The first signs of any real interest in the Indian Ocean by the Communists occurred in 1968 when a small Russian task force, including a cruiser, a missile-carrying frigate or destroyer and an anti-submarine vessel of the Soviet Pacific Fleet, spent about 4 months visiting ports in the Indian Ocean. Within a year, two more Soviet naval groups had ventured into the area. During one sortie, the naval craft escorted noncombatants of the Soviet space program for tracking and capsule recovery. But, their real mission, as it turned out, was to make sure everyone got a good look at their hammer and sickle ensigns.

From this level of activity, it has become clear that the Soviet Navy intends to maintain a continuing presence, much along the lines of that which they have done on a larger scale in the Mediterranean over the past half decade. It is not only the number of Soviet ships which makes the development of Soviet interest in the area obvious, but also the frequency of visits.

It may well be that the Indian Ocean will become an area in which the future of U.S. maritime policy may face its greatest test.

To date, the only interest we have taken to impose our influence, other than operate a near-ridiculous naval force consisting of a seaplane tender and two aging World War II destroyers, is to develop, along with the British, an air and radio communications base on Diego Garcia, an obscure atoll in the middle of the Indian Ocean. Purpose of the fa-

cility, which will cost \$19 million to build, is to fill a gap in worldwide U.S. naval communications and provide support for American and British ships and planes operating in the Indian Ocean. Officials say the base will also serve as an intelligence facility to monitor the movements of the expanding Soviet naval presence.

If the Soviet Union continues to emerge as the only visible power in the region through naval deployment, then the nations of this area may always have to consider their future with an eye to whether it will meet with the approval of Communist leadership. The United States does not have much time to "wait and see" what the ultimate Communist intentions in this region may be, unless we wish to chance letting the area go by default. The Soviet Union has already decided to maintain and increase their naval power there.

We must give some serious thought to the Indian Ocean—now.

#### PURE DRINKING WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, in a recent statement to colleagues in the House, I endeavored to point out the many areas of water-hygiene research which suffer from a lack of basic and applied research to determine both immediate and long-range health effects. During the past 2 years, virtually every recognized authority in the area of water hygiene has publicly stated that we are dangerously unaware of the effects which recently discovered water contaminants will have on future generations.

When confronted with the many scientific studies, magazine articles, and public statements on this subject, it would seem that responsible governmental authorities have been almost scandalously negligent in protecting the quality of our drinking water sources. Yet, this body has appropriated billions of dollars to combat water pollution, and you may ask, where is the problem?

Quite simply, the problem is one of oversight. Although we have launched a massive and largely successful program to treat the direct causes of pollution: Sewage, industrial wastes, pesticides—and the effects of pollution, such as eutrophication—we have largely overlooked the problem of drinking water hygiene. The fiscal year 1971 Federal water pollution control effort to abate the pollution of our lakes, streams, rivers, and coastal waters amounted to well over \$1 billion; yet, last year's total budget for the Office of Water Hygiene of the Environmental Protection Agency was \$2.8 million. This Office, which is charged with research, planning, and surveillance of drinking water standards and water distribution systems, was able to spend \$235,000 specifically for research on treatment and distribution of public water supplies.

Our failure to address this kind of research and development should not be interpreted to mean that Congress is not

willing to respond to these problems. Past accomplishments have been dramatically successful. To this day, many areas of the world are subject to epidemic outbreaks of waterborne diseases such as typhoid, yet these diseases were virtually eliminated in our own country by the 1930's, due to advances in drinking water treatment. The same can be said for our more recent efforts to halt pollution of interstate and coastal waterways. Less than \$1 million had been appropriated for advanced waste treatment programs prior to 1964. Yet, in a relatively short period of time, we can point with pride to the Lake Tahoe treatment program, which converts wastes into clean water meeting the highest standards. And we can be justly proud of the progress which is allowing successful treatment of the advanced eutrophication in the Great Lakes.

Not only are these advances worthy of note, but also the applied technology which has accompanied them. In effect, we now have the tools to investigate the chemical and biological contaminants in drinking-water sources, and our mandate is to match the successes in water treatment with future successes in water hygiene technology.

Mr. Speaker, many of the ideas I have mentioned are forcefully presented in a statement by Dr. Jay H. Lehr, executive director of the National Water Well Association, presented last year to the House Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization. Since Dr. Lehr so clearly describes the effort necessary to guarantee safe drinking water for the entire Nation, I would like to conclude these remarks by inserting portions of his statement:

#### DOES A WATER HYGIENE PROBLEM EXIST TODAY?

Overconfidence or apathy seems to pervade the public's attitude with respect to drinking water. Common daily experience plus a current myth about the future, falsely implies that the quality, safety and adequacy of our municipal water supply systems are above reproach. Perhaps the myth can be stated as follows: Everyone knows we have launched a massive water pollution control effort and that waterborne disease outbreaks are a thing of the past.

This statement is simply not true and the dangers of this misinformation are illustrated by the epidemic at Riverside, California in 1965 which affected 18,000 people, the 30% gastroenteritis attack rate in Angola, New York in 1968 due to a failure in the disinfection system, and the 60% infectious hepatitis attack rate which afflicted the Holy Cross football team in 1969 as a result of the ineffective cross connection control procedures.

The recent discovery of critical amounts of mercury in our water supplies as a result of industrial waste disposal is even more conclusive evidence of the existence of very current water hygiene problems.

The Federal Water Quality Administration has assumed the primary epidemiological role of digging up facts on the extent of the contamination. But FWQA has little capability for assessing human health effects of mercury, and even its data collection system based on quick telegraphed reports, may not be adequate. Likewise, the Food and Drug Administration has limited jurisdiction, coming into the picture only when the mercury is taken up in the food chain, which it apparently has.

The National Communicable Disease Cen-

ter (now known as Center for Disease Control) probably is best equipped to provide an over-all assessment of the health effects, but it came into the present picture late.

From the standpoint of environmental health, the point of all of this is that here we have a potentially lethal contaminant which has been allowed to build up to possibly dangerous levels in water, perhaps affecting many elements in the ecological balance, without coming to attention of Federal authorities (it is, after all, a national problem) and then dealt with in a piecemeal fashion by several agencies which rarely communicate their findings to each other.

It was this sort of fragmentation which presumably led to formation of the proposed Environmental Protection Administration. But will EPA be organized in such a way that a mercury contamination problem such as this, can be dealt with swiftly and effectively? And who will be providing the health data to EPA?

The answer to both these questions I believe, must be found in the establishment of a greatly strengthened Bureau of Water Hygiene working within the Environmental Protection Agency.

#### PAST SUCCESS IS THE KEY TO CURRENT FAILURE

In a somewhat different sphere, scientific work on chlorine and the discovery that it can disinfect drinking water is a major cause of the pollution of our waterways. I do not refer to the role that chlorine itself may play as a "pollutant," although, astonishing to say, this has been the subject of very little research. Rather, the confidence that chlorination would make any water supply "safe" no matter how badly polluted to start, is the keystone of our sewage disposal system, namely, "dump in the nearest river".

Speaking before the Diamond Jubilee Meeting of AWWA in 1956, Abel Wolman characterized the accomplishments of our forefathers over the preceding century, from the standpoint of the sanitary quality of the Nation's public water supply system, as "one of the most dramatic improvements in public health that the world has ever known." As a result of past progress such words as typhoid, dysentery and cholera have become anachronisms. For instance, diseases which plagued the cities of the East Coast in the mid-1880's have all but disappeared, such as typhoid fever, which has declined from 75-100 deaths annually per 100,000 persons to less than 0.1 on a National basis.

By the 1930's, the state-of-the-art in municipal drinking water treatment advanced to a point where water borne disease was all but eliminated. As part of our way of life, people expect to travel anywhere in the United States and drink water from public supplies without fear of getting sick. In other times and in other countries, the accomplishment of that feat would be considered an idealistic dream. Yet, the water works industry of the United States under unifying controls of federal and state health regulations made the dream come true during the first half of this century. All three elements, a knowledgeable and dedicated industry, a strong federal control effort, and intelligent determined regulation at the state level, were required to accomplish the feat.

There is ample evidence that after achieving safe water for the entire nation, federal and state efforts began to lag. Control in many areas has relaxed. Criteria standards, and design practices are still pointed toward prevention of communicable disease as they were in the 1920's. Not as they are now in 1970.

During the 1950's and 1960's, Federal, state and local program emphasis shifted from stressing the treatment and protection of our drinking water systems to curbing the discharge of organic pollutants at the source. The resultant decrease in interest or concern

has led to a backsliding of state and local community water supply programs which were evaluated against the U.S. Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards. In the face of lagging efforts at the federal level and in some states, imperfections in the nation's water supply are beginning to show up.

#### OUR WATER HYGIENE PROGRAM MUST BE UPDATED

C. C. Johnson, Administrator of Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, speaking in Sept. 1969, before the Chesapeake Section of AWWA on "Preliminary Findings of the Special Community Water Supply Survey", said, "The question we face is this: Are we going to wait until the public health statistics reveal a drinking water crisis or are we going to begin now to upgrade our water treatment and distribution systems to cope with the problems of our own time and place? In the case of water hygiene, as in all of the many environmental problems that face our Nation and the world today, if we must wait for epidemiological studies of human illness to convince us of the hazards, it may well be too late".

The philosophy of letting the nation's control over public water supplies deteriorate until adverse health effects are noted is condemned. In fact, it is generally conceded that the involuntary use of our citizens for bioassay is immoral. Yet, isn't that precisely what is being done, when a necessary condition for a budget increase, public health safeguards are allowed to fall lower and lower to the point where adverse health effects can be observed?

I think for a long while in this country we sort of mesmerized ourselves into thinking that the only water problems we had were water pollution control problems. As a result of that, very little attention was given to what we call the water hygiene aspects of the water problem.

The backsliding in local, county, state and Federal water hygiene programs can be traced to a lack of Federal leadership associated with the popular misconception, that water pollution control efforts are a panacea which will not only restore and enhance the quality of our lakes, streams, and coasts to the benefit of fish and aquatic life and recreational pursuits but also guarantee delivery of healthful quantities of safe drinking water to the consumer's tap. This is not true insofar as drinking water is concerned.

Water pollution control efforts can assist the delivery of safe water to the consumer's tap but the community drinking water supply must be treated in any event. Pure water can be collected, treated and delivered to individual homes only under the close scrutiny of competent local, state and Federal programs.

These programs must begin to receive the needed resources to conduct necessary planning and research both to catch-up on past voids and looking to the future, to provide training and technical assistance to assure full application of existing technology and to conduct active, constructive surveillance and enforcement programs.

#### FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

The Federal water pollution control effort of the Department of the Interior now exceeds \$800 million per year and is scheduled to rise to well over \$1 billion next year, while the Federal water hygiene efforts of the Bureau of Water Hygiene situated in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is currently being subject to a budget cut from \$2.7 million to \$2.4 million. I am in complete agreement with the major attack being waged through the Federal Water Quality Administration against water pollution. It must not be minimized in any way if it is to succeed. In contrast, however, I am appalled by minimal support being given to the Bureau of Water Hygiene.

It is crucial that we have support at the

Federal level to overlap state boundaries and variations in state capabilities in the field of water supply. There is no reason why there should be any better water supplies in one state than another, and the development of adequate criteria based on meaningful research is essential to our setting reasonable and understandable standards and then keeping these standards abreast of our changing environment.

The federal government has a responsibility and a role which it cannot avoid, and the water supply industry in the United States certainly encourages and depends upon the federal departments for fulfilling their responsibilities.

#### CURRENT COMMUNITY WATER SUPPLY STUDIES

The Community Water Supply Study was launched to determine the quality and dependability of water being delivered to a cross section of the population including many small towns up through the largest cities. A total of 969 public water supply systems located in 9 areas of the country have been investigated. The study includes 5% of the systems and 12% of the urban population on a National basis when compared with statistics from the last comprehensive facilities inventory conducted in 1962. In addition to large metropolitan systems like New York City, Cincinnati, and New Orleans, the study includes 760 systems serving populations of less than 5,000 persons.

Using the 1962 PHS Drinking Water Standards as a guide, each water supply system was investigated on three bases. First, drinking water quality was determined by sampling the finished and distributed water and returning these to the laboratories of the Bureau of Water Hygiene for bacteriological, chemical and trace metal analyses. Second, the status of the water supply system facilities was determined by a field survey of the system and the gathering of information on a) source of supply; b) treatment, if any; c) distribution system pressures, and d) operations. Finally, the status of the surveillance program over the water supply system was evaluated by obtaining bacteriological water quality data for the previous 12 months of record from state and county health department files.

While we all hold the Drinking Water Standards in high esteem, an unexpectedly high number of communities exceed either the recommended or mandatory constituent levels and a surprisingly larger number of communities show deficiencies in operations and surveillance.

For instance—in excess of 80% of 969 systems investigated, primarily communities of less than 100,000 people, failed to meet one or more of the provisions of the U.S. PHS Drinking Water Standards because of water quality deficiencies or system risks; one out of every four samples (based on 3,563 samples) exceeded one or more of the recommended limits in the Drinking Water Standards; 9% of the samples evidenced bacterial contamination at the consumers tap; 11% of the samples drawn from systems using surface waters as a source of supply exceeded the recommended organic chemical limit of 200 parts per billion; 53% of the systems evidenced physical deficiencies including poorly protected groundwater sources, inadequate disinfection capacity, inadequate clarification capability, and/or inadequate system pressure; 79% of the systems were not inspected by State or county authorities in 1968, the last full calendar year prior to the study, and 50% of the chief operators of the supplies did not remember when, if ever, a state or local health department has surveyed the supply; 77% of the plant operators had inadequate microbiological training and 46% were deficient in chemistry relating to plant operation; cross connection prevention ordinances, plumbing inspection programs on new construction, and re-in-

spection programs were lacking in a vast majority of the systems studied; the study showed that as to training 61% of the personnel responsible for the operation of water treatment facilities have not had formal training even at the short course level; 77% were deficient in microbiological training; 72% were deficient in chemical training.

The smaller water systems often operated by part-time personnel, generally have the poorest records of operator training and experience.

#### THE ADEQUACY OF WATER HYGIENE RESEARCH

We must not lose sight of research and development needs which exist today. Each of us faces a host of new questions on a day-to-day basis. One day the questions concern arsenic, the next day, nitrates. And how about mercury? Is there a general accepted detecting method? And, once the measurement is made, what criteria is used to judge health effects?

It is evident that a broad program of research and development is vitally needed to investigate and elucidate potential hazards, thereby insuring the strength of the Nation's water supplies and to provide for a higher degree of efficiency and effectiveness in the management of water supply systems. For example, a recent Bureau of Water Hygiene Report summarized some of the potential hazards as follows: "Water for direct and indirect human ingestion contains varying amounts of organic and inorganic material and in some cases may harbor bacteria and viruses. In order to safeguard the health of the American public by having the mechanism to detect, analyze, and remove any hazard in water, many studies MUST be conducted. Compounds to which people are exposed number in the thousands and include herbicides, insecticides, corrosion inhibitors, water softeners, coagulants, coagulant aids, fecal material, industrial waste material and breakdown products, household waste material and breakdown products."

Using the carbon-chloroform-extraction technique, it is known that many of these organic and inorganic compounds are in drinking water. What we need to know is: (1) Specifically, which chemicals are in water?; (2) What is the concentration of each chemical in the water?; (3) What are the efficiencies of recovery (for analysis) of the compounds?; (4) Are the chemicals at the environmental concentration a hazard, either acute or chronic, to the health of the users?; and (5) If a hazard exists, what procedures can be used to effectively cope with the problem? It is equally apparent that virology criteria must be added to future editions of the Drinking Water Standards stressing the need to develop new methods of sampling, isolating, concentrating and enumerating enteric viruses. And, aside from detection procedures, health effects, and constituent levels there is the need to develop and demonstrate new municipal and individual water treatment procedures.

#### SEEKS RIGHTS FOR GROWERS OF FLUE-CURED TOBACCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL) is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege at this time to introduce legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to extend to growers of flue-cured tobacco the right to lease and transfer poundage allotments through the entire marketing season.

I am honored to be sponsoring this bill with my friend and distinguished fellow member of the North Carolina congress-

sional delegation and fellow member of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES).

I am also quite pleased to have as cosponsors of this legislation such distinguished gentlemen as Mr. ABBITT, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. WAMPLER.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, is designed to have a stabilizing effect on the tobacco market, preventing growers from experiencing heavy losses in any given year by providing greater leeway in the amount of income a grower can receive through lease and transfer operations.

A similar provision was included in a burley tobacco bill, of which I was a sponsor, which was passed by the Congress on April 1.

That bill also provided for discretionary authority to be given the Secretary of Agriculture to determine if burley leases and transfers could be transacted throughout the marketing season.

Last week, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin made it known that this discretionary authority would be put to full and good use, that leasing and transfers of allotments could proceed through the marketing year.

The Secretary's decision was in response to a letter written to him last week by my distinguished colleagues, Mr. CARTER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. WAMPLER, and myself.

And I believe the time has now come to extend that same authority to the Secretary for flue-cured tobacco as well as burley, to extend to flue-cured growers the same right to a more stable income.

I believe this legislation being introduced today is needed in order to maintain the fairest, most effective policies possible, as they related to both flue-cured and burley tobacco growers, and to the tobacco industry in general.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for rapid passage of this equitable and much-needed legislation.

#### RICHARD ALAN PIZITZ IS BIRMINGHAM'S MAN OF THE YEAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, Birmingham's 1970 Man of the Year is Richard Alan Pizitz. He was nominated by the Birmingham Chapter of the National Secretaries Association and the Pilot Club of Birmingham and was selected over 15 other well-qualified nominees.

Citing his accomplishments as the 1970 president of the Greater Birmingham Area Chamber of Commerce as the basis for his nomination, those who nominated him pointed out that 178 new members joined the chamber in 1970—the largest number of new members in recent history. During his administration, the chamber raised \$1 million for industrial development and endorsed implementation of correct measures for pollution control.

It was also during his term, and in large measure through his efforts, that Birmingham was selected as one of the

Nation's 13 All-America cities in 1970. Besides his duties as chamber president, cochairman of the model cities program, and a member of the Birmingham Centennial Corp., board of directors.

An outstanding businessman, as well as civic leader, Mr. Pizitz has been president of Pizitz Department Store since 1966 and is a lifelong Birmingham resident.

Other outstanding community service which further enhanced his Man of the Year Award comprises his membership in the Community Affairs Committee, the advisory board of the University of Alabama in Birmingham, the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa Executive Advisory Board for the masters in business administration program, executive committee of the Samford University Chair of Private Enterprise, Miles College Advisory Council, National Young Leadership Cabinet of the United Jewish Appeal, Mayor's and Governor's Councils on Youth Opportunity.

The Birmingham Post Herald in saluting Mr. Pizitz editorially after his deserving selection said:

He was in every way the 1970 Man of the Year. It is only proper that he should receive the title officially.

No greater tribute could be paid a man than that paid Dick Pizitz by the Pilot Club which joined in his nomination, whose sentiments I share, when it wrote:

He expected no remuneration, no accolades, because his reward has been the deep satisfaction of helping his fellow man, his city, country, state, and nation.

#### THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF BETHLEHEM, PA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Episcopal Diocese of Bethlehem, Pa., is celebrating its 100th anniversary. Unlike so many anniversary observances, this celebration was not keyed solely to the diocese's past service and spiritual guidance in Pennsylvania communities. It was instead a refreshing, optimistic prediction of the church's expanded role as a leader in efforts to mend the tears in the fabric of American society in the next 100 years. Accordingly, on April 24, 1971, a panel of distinguished Americans, representing a broad cross-section of interest and endeavor, was invited to discuss several major problems which Americans will have to solve in the next century.

The Right Rev. Frederick J. Warnecke, bishop of Bethlehem, was the guiding force behind this unique and relevant genre of celebration. I would like to commend him for his energy and his efforts to make the Episcopal Church a creative, healing force in America.

I call the attention of my colleagues to two articles from the Bethlehem, Pa., Globe-Times, which report the various activities included in the diocese's 100th anniversary celebration:

[From the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Times,  
Apr. 24, 1971]

SENTIMENT AGAINST WAR STRONGER, PANEL-  
ISTS AGREE

(By Sharon Szymakowski)

A college president, a woman church leader and a former Pennsylvania governor all declared today that a great swelling of opposition to the Vietnam war has been growing in the U.S. over the past three months.

The statements were made in Grace Hall at Lehigh University during panel discussions on "Creativity in Crisis," the first major event opening the Episcopal Diocese of Bethlehem's centennial observance.

"One big reason for the changes," Yale University president Dr. Kingman Brewster told the audience of 600, "has been a realization that Vietnamization does not offer a chance for peace and the people have concluded that we have nothing left in Vietnam except continued killing."

Former Gov. William W. Scranton, presiding officer at the convocation, said that in his view, the change in opinion has occurred because of certain practical factors.

"A lot of people who have been in favor of this war now conclude that the war is wrong because we haven't been able to fight it as wars should be fought."

"The big question is how do we end it," Scranton continued. "It is not just a matter of getting out, but we have to consider our withdrawal in terms of what our leadership in the world is going to be after we get out."

Scranton, who recently served as chairman of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest, said we would like to see the war end, and that through its ending, the U.S. make an impact on the world that it is trying to uplift the value of peace.

"I hope we can come out with a plus in the eyes of the world," he said.

Dr. Cynthia Wedel, first woman president of the National Council of Churches, saw the Calley case as a factor for the change in the national mood.

MORAL HORRORS

"The ambiguities of the Calley suit brought home the moral horrors in this war," said the frequent Bethlehem visitor.

The discussion of the war's impact continued for several minutes prior to adjourning the convocation for a luncheon break.

The Rt. Rev. John E. Hines, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, said that during his travels in behalf of the church, he noticed a swelling of opinion against the war, particularly in the last three months.

He told the audience that the church's House of Deputies failed to come up with a definitive stand against the war during last year's convention in Houston.

But, he continued, "If such a meeting were to be held today, although I have no way of supporting it, I would say that the same body would take a strong position against the war."

John C. Goodbody, president of the Seabury Press, was panel moderator. He asked the war reaction question as a tie-in with this weekend's protests against the war in Washington, D.C.

In addition to Bishop Hines, Brewster and Dr. Wedel, taking part in the panel were the Rev. Herbert J. Rayan, professor of historical theology at Woodstock College, N.Y.; the Rev. Robert A. Bennett, a leader of the Union of Black Episcopalians; Harry Bertola, abstract sculptor, and Robert Saudek, film and television executive, who was unable to attend the morning session.

WELCOME BY BISHOP

The Rt. Rev. Frederick J. Warnecke, bishop of Bethlehem, gave welcoming remarks at the convocation's opening.

He made particular emphasis on welcoming those not of the Episcopalian faith. In

the audience were the Rt. Rev. Joseph McShea, bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Allentown, and Dr. Edwin H. Frey, director of the Greater Bethlehem Area Council of Churches, as well as leaders of other faiths.

Bishop Warnecke noted the unique concept of the Centennial saying there were no "self-congratulatory banquets."

He said that instead the diocese would present in panel form its concerns for the future, and would distribute contributions to the community rather than undertake fund drives for the church.

"In the happiness of this celebration the Diocese of Bethlehem is sensitively aware of the pain in the world today and of the crisis in man and in his society."

"There is the gross immorality of war, of poverty in the midst of plenty, of discrimination and injustice on the basis of race, of brutality. There is the break-down of communication not only between generations but between disciplines, between forms of art, between citizens and their government."

"There is a sense of lack of meaning in life for many, both old and young. There is a continuing destruction of the good earth by man's senseless pollution of it."

"There is the questioning of values, of institutions, of ideologies. Crisis seems like a pallid word to describe the situation."

"Yet we at the anniversary believe that this is not a cause for despair but rather a call to creativity of a radically new kind."

"This is the keynote of this Convocation—a call to hope and freedom expressed in many new ways and radically new forms."

NEXT 100 YEARS

"Centennial" for the Diocese of Bethlehem refers to the coming 100 years as not to the past. Centennial looks forward not backward. It is the beginning of an adventure in life in a new world that we make today in this Convocation."

Scranton introduced Cong. Fred B. Rooney, a city native, who read a brief statement of congratulations from President Richard Nixon. Greetings were also noted from Sens. Hugh Scott and Richard Schweiker, as well as Gov. Milton Shapp.

Scranton's introductions were humorous and pertinent. He occasionally elicited a ripple of laughter from his position in front of a huge world map backdrop.

Goodbody was equally at ease as moderator as he encouraged the audience to participate by asking questions.

Dr. Wedel, Rev. Mr. Bennett and Father Ryan gave formal presentations during the morning session.

Bertola's presentation was anything but formal—he played tapes that combined sounds of some of his metal sculptures, stating they were "free as the wind."

The final panelists completed their presentations in the afternoon.

Dr. Wedel said during her presentation that "the only source of creativity is people. God created us so that we could be creative."

She spoke of the different approaches of the "establishment" and of minority groups.

"The Establishment comes prepared with facts to use in choosing the most rational and useful solution," Dr. Wedel said.

"Ghetto people come with emotional drives, and couldn't care less about rationality. Each group is right. There is a good deal to be said about rationality. Also we can think of hurting badly and wanted to get something done immediately."

She said that out of this may come a clue for solving the crisis.

IF WE LISTEN

"We are at the exciting creative point that people are coming face-to-face. The potential creativity in confrontation and conflict can be recognized if we listen to people."

She suggested listening to the minority voices, and to the young. Challenging the

overemphasis on rationality and practicality, Dr. Wedel urged listening and learning from one another as a possible solution to current crises.

TWO PERSPECTIVES

Rev. Mr. Bennett told the audience he was speaking from the perspective of a black, and from the larger view of an American.

"One of the things we are beginning to realize is that we are here and here to stay."

He mentioned this fact as one that blacks are finally understanding, as are whites. "The problem for us has been recognizing who we are," the theologian said.

"What the United States needs is not simply to react, but to respond. As Christians, our call is to do just that."

Speaking again of black oppression, he said, "We are the symbol of the fact that humiliation and defeat need not destroy. We are looking forward with hope."

"Our outlook is a positive thing, and with religious connotations. We hope that Americans will respond, not react, and in that response we will all face the future unafraid."

Father Ryan undertook the "Creativity in Crises" theme from three viewpoints—that of a priest, a historian and a theologian.

"As a priest, I see a concrete way in which Joseph and Mary responded to crises by the creativity of their daily lives. As a historian, I see social responses between the individual and society."

"And as a theologian, I think of creativity in terms of hope and redemption."

The noted ecumenist said he was fearful of the attitudes he has confronted, those that have an "awareness of change but no sense of crisis." He said he feels that the actual crisis is the refusal to see that a crisis exists.

A possible solution, Father Ryan stated was to change current institutions with trust and hope.

SIGNIFICANT CHANGE

The Rev. Mr. Bennett, in answer to a question, told the group he has noted a "significant change" in the attitude of the black community in the past few years.

"Burn it down was heard from the blacks a few years ago but you don't hear it anymore," he reported.

Attitude now, he said, is one of "building up". The Rev. Mr. Bennett noted there is a mood of "getting one's house in order" in preparation for being fully accepted "for the first time" as citizens of this country.

In a lighter touch, he quipped that he recognizes just how much of an influence blacks have made by the "soul" music offered by the Moravian band. Also, he noted, a white mother asked him recently how he liked her son's "Afro-haircut".

Turning serious, he said that to overcome the black-white problem, "you have to see people as individuals".

Perhaps, the clergyman stated, music, which is part of the black's culture, might lead the way.

As with the music, so might racial issues be solved "by letting ourselves go and forgetting about taboos such as don't get too near and others", he maintained.

After a question on creativity in education was raised, Mrs. Wedel challenged an attitude of "What was good enough for me and my father is good enough for my children" as "very damaging to our society."

Formerly, she said, educational methods were "stifling" and people were forced into a certain mold.

Under new education concepts, Mrs. Wedel related, children are no longer part of "a harsh, competitive system but are, instead in an atmosphere in which brighter ones help the slower, and in which each helps the other."

The morning session ended dramatically with a 10-minute taped performance of music created by Bertola on vertical metal rods which he designed.

When some 100 of the instruments vibrated on tape, Grace Hall was filled with the full harp-like sounds.

[From the Bethlehem (Pa.) Globe-Time, Apr. 26, 1971]

**ART SHOW CAPPING DIOCESE "CREATIVITY" EVENTS SEEN BY 1,000**

(By Lois Simonds)

A "Creativity in Crisis" art exhibit at Lehigh University, viewed by some 1000 persons, capped weekend observances of the 100th anniversary of Bethlehem Diocese of the Episcopal Church.

The exhibit, which opened yesterday and will continue through May 9, brought to a dramatic conclusion the weekend observances during which a panel comprised of noted educators, politicians, artists and clergymen on Saturday called for a renewed concern for human needs.

Revolution or social despair by young people were pictured as the two alternatives by former governor William W. Scranton unless changes are made in this country.

He called for changes in Congress in state legislatures and in the judicial system.

"Last year college students worked very hard to bring about some changes . . . in some cases they were set back by acts of violence . . . but now a great number of them have become despairing," he told some 600 persons in Lehigh's Grace Hall.

**SCRANTON WARNS**

While noting that social change can never come fast enough for young people, he stressed "it can come soon if we all work at it."

"We have to be strong and willing to take sides and to say things that are not popular . . . if we give up, we have to be ready for revolution," warned the former governor, who served as head of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest.

Scranton declared "A leader must be ahead of the people and when he gets behind them people have an opportunity to do something about it."

As an example of incidences of people "frequently being ahead of leaders," he cited the political campaign of Eugene McCarthy. "He was so convincing in the primaries that the president (Lyndon Johnson) decided not to run."

Other members of Saturday's panel were Dr. Kingman Brewster Jr., Yale University president; Robert Saudek, film and television executive; Harry Bertola, sculptor and Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel, former president of the National Council of Churches.

Also serving as panel members were John C. Goodbody, president of Seabury Press; the Rt. Rev. John E. Hines, presiding Episcopal bishop; the Rev. Robert A. Bennett, assistant professor of biblical studies at Episcopal Theological Seminary, and the Rev. Herbert J. Ryan, professor of historical theology at Woodstock College.

**YOUTH WORK PROPOSAL**

Dr. Brewster proposed that human needs might be improved by conscripting young people for two or three years to do physical labor in the cities to clean them and to work toward a halt of other environmental decay.

"We must be willing in the '70s literally to mobilize for decency" he told the gathering.

Dr. Brewster stated "We must consider universal service as the essential down payment on our freedom."

Mrs. Wedel, who is associate director of the Center of Voluntary Service, called for a need to challenge "the overemphasis on the rational and the practical."

Noting that it was very important in the early days of America to establish law and order, she contended "Now we must begin to realize that we've done that job at a great cost to a great many people, done it by keeping many people in their place."

Mrs. Wedel called for a challenge of many assumptions which "are behind many of our hangups today." Among these assumptions, she noted, are that there may not be enough material things to go around, that by giving "someone else a little freedom we lose some ourselves," and the assumption that peace and tranquility are the best things to work for.

**SCIENCE NOT ENOUGH**

Saudek, a visiting lecturer in visual studies at Harvard University, noted "science is not enough, it does not kindle man's soul."

Stating that in some television today, "the miracles of truth-telling are stifled by government," he called for major changes in the use of television.

Among the changes he proposed were for free television time to be given to all legally qualified political candidates, that candidates should appear themselves, and that commercial and public broadcasters should establish in federal courts . . . "once and for all" their rights under the First Amendment.

Saudek also cited a need for public television to take its side, with financial and creative independence, alongside commercial television.

Father Ryan warned against a trend to make the universe "the most efficient highway system in the world to get nowhere."

He maintained that the greatest place for change and creativity is within institutions but he pointed out that man must not trust institutions too much nor must the institution be totally rejected.

Father Ryan proposed a change, made within the institutions, with trust, confidence and hope.

**RESPOND, NOT REACT**

The Rev. Mr. Bennett, the only Negro on the panel, urged the group to listen to what the black man has to say and then, he said, the white community should respond, not react.

Explaining the difference, he noted that for whites to say simply no to Negro demands or to simply ask what to do for blacks is reaction. For whites to take seriously the persons involved in a situation, to take seriously what is being said, is a response, the Rev. Mr. Bennett stated.

The Rt. Rev. Frederick J. Wahnecke, Bishop of Bethlehem Diocese, welcomed the panelists.

Among the visitors to the art exhibit was Charles Lucet, French Ambassador to the United States, who made the stop after speaking at Lafayette College. He was a weekend guest of Mr. and Mrs. I. C. Hanners of Springtown.

Included in the Episcopal centennial art exhibit which opened yesterday, are works by Winslow Homer, Whistler, John Singer Sargent, and Thomas Moran.

The assemblage of American art works was coordinated by Mrs. Peter Prichett as part of the centennial celebration of the Episcopal Diocese. Co-chairman of the exhibit was Mrs. Philip I. Berman.

Part of the exhibit was a lithograph by Mrs. Jonas Salk, wife of the noted scientist and developer of polio vaccine. The poster created by Mrs. Salk reflects the exhibition's theme "Creativity in Crisis" and showed a youth opening a path to a town.

**CONGRESSIONAL POLICY STATEMENT NEEDED TO PUSH USE OF RECYCLED MATERIALS IN FIGHT TO CLEAN UP THE ENVIRONMENT**

(Mr. DOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, all of us are

concerned about what is happening to our environment and the efforts being made to clean it up. I have been conducting an extensive study since the beginning of the 92d Congress. The Federal Government can make a major move in this field by merely making the policy decision to encourage the use of the greatest amount of recycled material in all the products it purchases.

The Federal Government is the largest single purchaser of many items purchased in the U.S. market. With little or no additional cost to the taxpayers the Federal Government can help immensely by encouraging greater use of recycled material. Legislation I introduced yesterday with 40 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle will require all Federal departments and agencies to make greater strides in using products made from recycled material.

Joining me in this legislation are LES ASPIN, Democrat, Wisconsin; HERMAN BADILLO, Democrat, New York; JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, Democrat, New York; BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN, Republican, Georgia; JOHN BRADEMAN, Democrat, Indiana; JAMES A. BURKE, Democrat, Massachusetts; JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, New Hampshire; SILVIO O. CONTE, Republican, Massachusetts; JOHN D. DINGELL, Democrat, Michigan; DON EDWARDS, Democrat, California; EDWIN W. EDWARDS, Democrat, Louisiana; MARVIN L. ESCH, Republican, Michigan; EDWIN B. FORSYTHE, Republican, New Jersey; DONALD M. FRASER, Democrat, Minnesota; SAM GIBBONS, Democrat, Florida.

ELLA T. GRASSO, Democrat, Connecticut; GILBERT GUDE, Republican, Maryland; KEN HECHLER, Democrat, West Virginia; HENRY HELSTOSKI, Democrat, New Jersey; FRANK HORTON, Republican, New York; JACK F. KEMP, Republican, New York; EDWARD I. KOCH, Democrat, New York; PETER N. KYROS, Democrat, Maine; CLARENCE D. LONG, Democrat, Maryland; PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, Jr., Republican, California; ROMANO L. MAZZOLI, Democrat, Kentucky; PATSY T. MINK, Democrat, Hawaii; ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Republican, Wisconsin; J. J. PICKLE, Democrat, Texas; BERTRAM L. PODELL, Democrat, New York; CHARLES B. RANGEL, Democrat, New York; FRED B. ROONEY, Democrat, Pennsylvania; J. EDWARD ROUSH, Democrat, Indiana.

WILLIAM F. RYAN, Democrat, New York; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, Republican, California; ROBERT O. TERNAN, Democrat, Rhode Island; JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, Democrat, Pennsylvania; LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS, Republican, Pennsylvania; CHARLES H. WILSON, Democrat, California; and LESTER L. WOLFF, Democrat, New York.

The major complaint of the recycling industry is that they cannot compete for Federal purchases because specifications in many areas exclude recycled material despite the fact that a recycled product can be as good and as economical.

The Federal Government should take the lead in the effort to use recycled material to the greatest extent possible. In many cases it can be accomplished without an increase in cost. In those other cases some increase will be justified when we consider it as part of the price of saving our environment.

Our first bill, H.R. 8005, authorizes and

directs the General Services Administration and the Defense Supply Agency to purchase paper for Federal use with as great an amount of recycled material as is possible consistent with the purpose for which the paper was procured.

This bill will eliminate restrictive specifications which until recently have barred recycled paper. While the General Services Administration has started slowly to revise its specifications, congressional action is imperative to assure that the policy of utilizing recycled material is crystal clear.

Unfortunately only 14 of the 122 GSA paper specifications have been changed to date and these to a bare minimum.

The second bill, H.R. 8007, is a study bill which established a Federal policy for the maximum use of recycled materials at all levels of procurement. The bill also requires a joint study and recommendations by the two procuring agencies of the Federal Government, the General Services Administration and the Defense Supply Agency.

Heretofore, under the Waste Recovery Act passed by Congress in 1970, demonstration grants and some study effort of recycled materials by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was provided. My bill takes the approach that the procuring agencies should get into the act, and report back to Congress within 6 months on what they are doing and can plan to do, and report annually on their progress each year thereafter.

To demonstrate the feasibility of using recycled paper I decided to become the first Congressman to print his regular constituent newsletter on recycled paper. The newsletter, which I circulated among House Members a week ago Friday, was printed on 50 percent recycled paper. This paper is of equal, if not better, quality than other offset papers and, most important, the cost was comparable.

The procurement mechanism will, I feel, prove the point that if a free market is opened up for those in the recycling industry, they can and would compete. Endless tons of paper litter our streets and highways and fill unsightly dumps. The first annual report of the Council on Environment Quality, issued in August 1970, said only 19 percent of scrap paper discarded in the United States was ever reused. Compare this to the 50 percent of paper which the Japanese reclaim and reprocess each year for the use of their people.

Much the same can be said for other solid wastes which eventually wind up as air, water, or land pollution.

The Federal Government must take the lead in promoting the use of recycled material. There are many products and materials which are simply discarded as solid waste when they have been used or damaged. This accumulation of waste matter presents a danger to health and welfare to every American. We can no longer afford the luxury of dumping these items and destroying the environment.

Many products and material could be recovered and reused as the raw material for new products and materials. Such recovery would eliminate the noxious

and dangerous accumulation of solid waste. At the same time it would further efforts to conserve natural resources and preserve the environment.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that positive steps are also being taken by the Joint Committee on Printing which is reviewing its purchases of papers used by the Government Printing Office. This report is to be completed by July.

Mr. Speaker, one of the keys to solving our solid waste problem is to make people aware that there is a tremendous loss of resources when discarded material simply lies in a dump, cluttering up the landscape. As I have said I feel the Federal Government must take the lead and use products made from recycled material whenever it can.

In the district I am privileged to represent there are efforts to increase the use of recycled material. The town of Ramapo in Rockland County is using recycled paper. The city and State of New York are making efforts in this direction and I am sure there are others that I have not heard about.

Newspapers in the 27th District of New York are also using recycled paper in their publications. Among them are the Poughkeepsie Journal, the Rockland Journal-News and the Evening News in Newburgh.

I would strongly urge every Member of this House to look into the use of recycled material in his own office and to encourage his State and local officials to do the same.

This is a simple, painless, and in many cases cost-free way of eliminating a great deal of solid waste, cleaning up the environment and conserving natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the text of my two bills for the information of my colleagues.

#### H.R. 8005

A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Congress hereby finds that—*

(1) there are many products and materials which, after they have been used or damaged, are discarded or scrapped as waste matter;

(2) the accumulation of this waste matter presents a danger to the health and welfare of the citizens of the United States;

(3) many products and materials (otherwise discarded as waste matter) could be recovered and reused as the raw material for new products and materials;

(4) such recovery and reuse of such waste matter will abate the noxious and dangerous accumulation of such waste matter and will aid in the effort to conserve our scarce natural resources; and

(5) the Federal Government has the responsibility to lead in the effort to utilize recycled material by procuring and using, to the greatest extent possible, those products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled material.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") and the Administrator of the General Serv-

ices Administration (hereinafter referred to as the "Administrator") to take the necessary and proper actions to insure the procurement and use (to the greatest extent possible) by the Federal Government of products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled material, and to jointly conduct a full and complete study of the feasibility of the procurement and use by the Federal Government of such products and materials.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary and the Administrator are authorized and directed to take the necessary and proper actions, including the promulgation of standards and regulations, to ensure the procurement and use (to the greatest extent possible) by the department, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government of products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled material. Such standards and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, or by the Administrator, shall be promulgated in the same manner as those standards and regulations promulgated under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 relating to procurement and use by the Federal Government of personal property.

(b) The Secretary, through the Defense Supply Agency, and the Administrator are authorized and directed to jointly conduct a full and complete study of which products and materials procured or used by the departments, agencies, or instrumentalities of the Federal Government could be required to have, as part of their composition, recycled material while meeting the use specifications of such departments, agencies, or instrumentalities.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary and the Administrator, in carrying out the joint study under this Act, are authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality any information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this Act, and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed, to the extent permitted by law, to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary and the Administrator, upon their joint request.

(b) For the purposes of securing the necessary scientific data and information the Secretary and the Administrator may jointly make contracts with universities, research institutions, foundations, laboratories, and other competent public or private agencies to conduct research into the various aspects of the problem of using products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled material. For such purposes, the Secretary and the Administrator are authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code.

SEC. 4. The Secretary and the Administrator shall report to the Congress, from time to time, the findings and results of the study conducted under this Act and the final report shall be made no later than the one hundred and eightieth day after the date of enactment of this Act. Such final report shall include the findings and results of the study, and specifically—

(1) recommendations as to the necessary and proper legislative, administrative, or other actions that should be taken in order to ensure that the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government procure and use (whenever possible) products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled material; and

(2) what actions the Secretary and Administrator have already taken, either jointly or separately, to promote and ensure the

procurement and use by such departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of such products and materials.

Sec. 5. The Secretary and the Administrator shall make a joint annual report to the Congress with respect to the progress that they are making in providing for the procurement and use by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government of products and materials which have, as part of their composition, recycled materials. The report submitted under this section shall be submitted to the Congress within 60 days after the end of the calendar year for which such report is submitted. The first such report shall be due within 60 days after the end of the first calendar year ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 6. For the purposes of this Act the term "recycled material" means any product or material completed for sale or use which has been—

- (1) scrapped, used, damaged, or otherwise discarded; and
- (2) recovered in whole or in part and reused as all or part of the contents of any new material or product; or
- (3) the salvageable wastes or by-products of which are recovered and reused as all or part of the contents of any new material or product.

H.R. 8007

A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of the General Services Administration to prescribe regulations with respect to the amount of recycled material contained in paper procured or used by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 201 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:*

"(f) (1) Except as provided in subparagraph (2), the Administrator shall prescribe regulations establishing standards with respect to the contents of any paper procured or used by any Federal agency or the District of Columbia. Such regulations shall specify that the contents of such paper shall consist of as great an amount of recycled material as is possible consistent with the purpose for which such paper was procured.

"(2) In carrying out the provisions of this subsection, the Administrator shall coordinate his efforts with the requirements, policies and authority of the Joint Committee on Printing as indicated under section 313 of chapter 3, and chapter 5 of Title 44 of the United States Code (relating to standards of quality of paper).

"(3) Except for the provisions of subparagraphs (4) and (7) of section 602(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, the regulations prescribed by the Administrator under this subsection shall apply (in as uniform a manner as is practicable) to all paper procured or used in the United States by any Federal agency or the District of Columbia.

"(4) For the purposes of regulations prescribed by the Administrator under this subsection, the term 'recycled material' means any paper which:

- (1) has served the purpose for which it was originally manufactured;
- (2) has been scrapped or otherwise discarded as an element of solid waste; and
- (3) has been recovered in whole or in part and reprocessed into a new raw material used in the manufacturing process of new paper; except that such term shall not mean those materials generated by the paper manufacturing process and reused within a plant as part of such process.

"(5) For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'United States' means the fifty

States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

Sec. 2. Section 602(d) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out at the beginning of such section "Nothing" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in section 201(f), nothing".

#### ADDITIONAL SUPPORT TO EXTEND THE CHILDREN AND YOUTH COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PROJECTS WHICH EXPIRE JUNE 30, 1972

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, support for H.R. 7657 is increasing. The bill which would extend for an additional five years, the children and youth comprehensive health projects which are now slated for oblivion as of June 30, 1972, has at this time 37 cosponsors. There are at the present 67 programs in 29 States delivering comprehensive health care to 450,000 children and youth of lower socioeconomic levels in central cities and rural areas. These children and youth projects represent one of the major reservoirs of experience in comprehensive health care today, especially to the poor children of the country.

I urge Members to become cosponsors of this legislation. I am appending to my statements further information on some of these programs:

#### SUMMARY IMPACTS OF THE CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAMS

(By Vernon E. Weckwerth, Ph. D., director, systems development project, University of Minnesota)

The Children and Youth program is unique by legislative design and has demonstrated its effectiveness in organizational impacts on care delivery, effective implementation of planned, continuous, complete care which by a certain number of measures have produced healthier children. The program is also characterized by the existence of having an information system which not only can measure performance and costs of care on an ongoing basis but predict these as well.

For the program as a whole, the 69 service delivery projects have over 490,000 registered children and youth out of a maximum residing in these geographical service areas of 3.4 million children and youth. These children are from the least well, lowest income, most health-service deprived populations across the nation.

#### MAJOR IMPACTS

1. For the first time, health departments, teaching hospitals and medical schools became directly involved, as both grantees and deliverers, in both preventive and curative services for large populations of children. As a result medical school curricula were changed and additionally, organizational capacities to deliver care created for the first time in most grantees.

2. The disease distributions of presenting conditions were changed as children moved from encounter care services to supervised care. Conditions believed to be preventable have in most cases dropped in prevalence among the registrants. Most dramatic are the rising rates of "well children" upon subsequent assessment for those who have been under planned service programs.

3. By reorganizing and experimenting critical interchange and substitution of lower cost, local health workers can do the job in lieu of non-available and higher cost personnel.

4. Service linkages to the polyplot of other purveyors have been established, and a coordinated service system is now operational in many projects with good progress being made in most others.

5. Because of its management information system, the C & Y Program is the only health program that can give quarter by quarter data on measures of continuity, completeness and costs of care as well as future trend data on delivery and costs. Such measures as backlogs of services, terminations, retention, changes in health status, hospitalization and cost measures provide a self-correcting data for administrative decision making.

#### SELECTED FINDINGS

1. Rates of hospitalization have fallen to about one-third of what they were three years ago.

2. Costs of care per child year have dropped by over 30% during the last 2½ years—this in spite of national trend of nearly the reverse magnitude. The numbers reflect actual dollar costs, unadjusted for inflation, but including all federal and matching funds.

3. All services, not just medical and hospital care but full dental services, nursing, nutrition, speech and hearing, social service, physical and occupational therapy are included for all children who need them. Many of these services are provided on a family basis because individual case care would not solve the problem. Even with these complete and continuous services, the costs per child year range from a regional high average of about \$375 per child per year to a national average of \$130 per child per year. As compared to the national average of some \$350 per man, woman and child in the nation, these projects are performing at unanticipated low costs—particularly considering that these children are drawn from the least healthy areas in the nation.

#### CONCLUSION

Without doubt, not all of the answers are available to all questions, but more is known for decision- and policy-making purposes about the C & Y program, and more results are demonstrated for this program than for any other federally sponsored health care program. These projects are living evidence of 69 unique ways of demonstrating that care can be delivered effectively to the most deprived parts of our populace on a complete, continuous, planned, quality basis, yet at a cost which this nation not only can afford, but more importantly, cannot afford not to continue. This evidence of diversity in delivery to match local idiosyncrasies yet with national review and assessment is critically important as a policy consideration as well—lest we once again make the mistake and produce one uniform program which on the average fits the nation as a whole, but individually fits nowhere within the country.

#### THE CAPTIVE NATIONS SCORECARD AND CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 18-24

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the 1971 Captive Nations Week coming up in the period of July 18-24, it is not too soon for our Members to begin relating the whole issue of Vietnam to the basic captive nations fact. Fundamentally, our successful struggle in Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia is to prevent the addition of other peoples and nations to the already staggering and long list of captive nations. As has been so often in the past, those who would undermine our struggle and the President's resolve for the national self-determination of South Vietnam, Laos, and

Cambodia—regardless of the motivation or reason—would be contributing to the extension of the captive nations list, which is only another way of saying the accommodation of determinative Soviet Russian aggression through a Hanoi proxy.

The article on "The Captive Nations Scorecard," authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University for the summer issue of the *Ukrainian Quarterly*, examines against a meaningful background the critical test that Moscow, basically, has posed for us in Vietnam. As he puts it with reference to Vietnam, "The mess President Nixon inherited has been progressively dissipated, and we can come out of it honorably and successfully if responsible Americans can stubbornly resist the use of this vital issue as a political football in our domestic politics." But reckless domestic politics is not the entire explanation. In his captive nations approach to political warfare on the U.S. terrain, he states:

One would have to be blind, indeed, not to see Hanoi's long arm of supporters in most of the antiwar demonstrations here.

Not only Vietnam and political warfare in the United States are specifically related to the captive nations approach in this article, but also other contemporary events, such as the Kudirka case, the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Secretary of State Rogers' plea for "a policy no longer haunted by the past, but committed freshly to the opportunities for the future." In the captive nations rest these opportunities for they are the real issue of peoples in bondage and under tyranny. For its syncretical qualities, I commend this article to the reading of our Members and our represented people:

#### THE CAPTIVE NATIONS SCORECARD

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

With the cross-currents of opinion and irresponsible, as well as subversive, action prevalent in the United States, the annual maintenance of a scorecard on the captive nations becomes increasingly necessary. Not that this country is an immediate candidate for the list, although this situation could be radically altered by a significant technologic breakthrough on the part of the Russians, but rather that other nations are on the brink of being listed by virtue of typical American impatience and protracted inability to understand the incessant Cold War we're pitted in. It is not without striking significance that those areas of the world which are currently most affected by Cold War operations, both as potential victims and aggressors, are also vividly aware of the massive reality of the captive nations and the lasting utility of captive nations analysis. This includes particularly the free area of Asia and, on the side of the aggressor, Moscow, Peking and Hanoi.

The manifest irony of the contemporary situation, roughly the past thirteen years, is that the "home of the free and the brave," where the Captive Nations Week Resolution originated and the captive nations movement in its total meaning was launched, has on the popular level shown to be relatively hesitant, fearful, and somewhat confused. To be sure, in broad outlines of official structure and private participation the movement continues to be well intact, but its full con-

tent of implementation in government and beyond still remains only potential in character. In tune with the note of cumulative causation in history itself, the origin and growth of the movement in the United States have been substantially documented and doubtlessly will serve as an indispensable background for the near future.<sup>1</sup> Also, on the tenth anniversary of the passage of the resolution Congress accommodated the publication of a cogent presentation of official views concerning the movement.<sup>2</sup> However, despite these and numerous other evidences of the broad outlines, the dominant fact is that the United States—again, broadly speaking—lags behind other areas of the world in understanding and appreciation of the captive nations approach.

Why has this ironical condition been so? This question is often posed after lectures on the subject have practically given the main points of explanation. The answers to this seemingly complex question are actually more than one. The first and foremost is the uncanny ignorance of our populace, both formally educated and less so, concerning the Soviet Union, the chief area of threat and hostility toward the U.S. This may sound like a harsh indictment of our people, but assuredly in any forum devoted to the subject it wouldn't take long to detect serious weaknesses on this score. Closely related to this, indeed buttressing it, is the typical American distaste for history, for the fundamental requisite of knowing how an object or situation has come to be what it is. Aside from the subject of the cumulative development of the captive nations, far too many aren't even cognizant of the unique development and precious traditions of these United States; witness many a fool permitted to speak from a college rostrum on the vacuity of history. The third all-embracing explanation covers a wide range of phenomena and activities under one sufficient caption—a growing demoralization in respect for authority and the individual person. No matter how one attempts to twist or distort it with notions that are thought to be new, this caption more than adequately embraces the fleeting superficialities of our times, such as sex mania, drugs addiction, oriental-styled demonstrations, bombings, women's liberation, accented crime, pornography, black, student and other forms of illusory power, and a host of other acultural expressions of human exhibitionism.

Mention is necessarily made here of these superficialities, which some self-made philosophers regard as "change," solely because they pertain in some degree as corrosive agents to the moral fibre of our nation which, whether it is generally recognized or not, is the ultimate target of both Moscow and Peking. The morale of a nation is in a way even far more important than its armament, and to the extent that it is being progressively undermined, as here in the United States, the nation becomes increasingly vulnerable not, as many think, to some sort of radical or communist takeover, but rather to excesses of reaction within and miscalculations without that will inevitably lead to a hot, global war.

Since 1965, after the critical presidential campaign the fall before, the U.S. has become a fertile terrain for political warfare by manipulated indigenous forces and external influences. Korea, Hungary, Cuba and now Vietnam symptomize with cumulative effect the steady erosion of America's national will to employ its vested power, both physical and moral, to curb decisively the aggressive designs of the remaining two imperial complexes in the world, the USSR and Red China. Allied with the demoralizing agents are the neo-isolationism, self-indictment and mas-

ochism sweeping several sectors of the nation that cannot help but implode with a variety of spurious, moralistic rationalizations and unstably concern itself with matters of secondary and trivial import on the scale of world conflict.

#### AMERICA'S LOSS OF MORAL CONSCIENCE

In all of this not so complex environment, what is of crucial importance to the evolving captive nations analysis is America's progressive loss of moral conscience toward one billion of humanity under totalitarian Red tyranny and oppression. This dismal development goes hand-in-hand with our growing incapability to undertake the primary and essential tasks of Free World leadership and responsibility. Vacuous utterances about "policing the world" and the like are nothing but expressions of insularity toward the realities of our world. Any translated objectification given to them would certainly produce vacuums that our enemies would rapidly occupy to our severe strategic disadvantage. Logically, no matter how you slice it, the interwoven pattern of eroded national will, disused power, confusion as to the historical meaning of America, rationalized pre-occupations with ostrich-like activities, and an appalling loss of moral conscience toward the billion of humanity reduces itself to a declining faith in world freedom, which can and will include our own in the end if redress and leadership along the line are found wanting.

For some time now it has been of intriguing interest to the writer and others that practically all of the self-proclaimed advocates of "social justice," the instant "humanists," our "sociological" preachers and the like tend to be long on moralistic exhortations relevant to ostrich-like absorptions and completely silent when it comes to the captive nations and their relevancy to our long-term freedom. A number of causal reasons can be offered to explain this glaring fact—yes, including even ignorance and subversive intent—but the fact is simply mentioned here to point out the freedom-conscience gap on the part of a current vocal segment in our nation. However, inexorable events, if not reasoned judgment, will in the trying years ahead fill in this gap and fully justify and substantiate the captive nations analytical approach. It surely doesn't require much common sense to perceive the simple truth that gained freedoms at home—and there have been many—will count for naught if total national freedom is perilously endangered and lost.

#### OTHERS CONSCIOUS OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

While the U.S., most countries in Free Europe, and Japan pursue business-as-usual and wallow in a maze of implosiveness and every imagined domestic problem, others on both sides of the dividing line between developing democracy and totalitarianism maintain, but for different reasons, a vivid consciousness about the over two dozen captive nations. Those who are particularly threatened by Red imperialist totalitarianism have advanced the captive nations movement with unprecedented fervor and dedication. In Asia, from the Republic of Korea down to the Philippines and India, the annual observance of Captive Nations Week grows progressively and activities throughout the year, such as the World Anti-Communist Conference, place stress on the haunting reality of all the captive nations.<sup>3</sup> The Republic of China, cognizant of the some 700 million captives on the mainland, has consistently and superlatively propagated the truths about all the captive nations. Needless to say, those closest to the borderline of freedom in Asia, even including to some degree Japan, cannot avoid being conscious of the cumulative list of captive nations, for the immediate threat over-

Footnotes at end of article.

shadowing them is the threat of their addition to the list.

For reasons negative in character the opposite side, too, is conscious of the captive nations movement. Obviously the movement pertains to the very populaces under their totalitarian control and in the long-run points to the expansion of freedom and the demise of their tyrannical regimes. From 1959 to the present, the record of persistent denunciation against Captive Nations Week by Moscow, Peking and the less significant Red centers is a long and vehement one. Could one expect it to be otherwise when the resolution itself lays bare the nature of the enemy and his cumulative conquests? One of the latest tirades against the movement, published in several Moscow organs and in a variety of languages for its world distribution, makes for fascinating reading in abuses of half-truths. For instance, it is stated, "The facts show that the provocative activity of the organizers of Captive Nations Week increases sharply whenever the international situation is aggravated." This half-truth is then applied to the Russian rape of Czecho-Slovakia with the strong implication that captive nations advocates should have remained silent in the name of "peaceful co-existence" as interpreted by the Russians. One often wonders what level of mentality Red propagandists strive to impress.

In the realistically structured thought of captive nations analysis, this and similar contrived Red dialectics can be handled with ease. Typical of Russian distortions, for example, the same source attacks the writer's book in this vicious vein: "The author of this vindictive scrawl literally falls over himself, attempting to prove that the Soviet Union is 'vulnerable in the national respect.' This preacher of fascist ideology, repeating the hackneyed propaganda thesis of Goebbels' ministry, openly advocates a preventive war against the USSR." The play on a reader's naiveté here is infinite. As to facts, the inner quote by the Red writer is his own fabrication. *The Vulnerable Russians* or any of my writings purposely avoid a depiction of the USSR as a national state. And on the matter of preventive war, this, too, is his concoction, for nowhere can he find a substantiation of this in twenty-five years of literary output. As to guilt by theoretic association with the Nazis, this technique scarcely needs comment. Despite numerous basic differences in the thesis, let it be said that even the devil preys upon the good for his own diabolical ends, as the Russian totalitarians themselves so well know and practice.

Briefly, the captive nations mode of analysis and approach, which is so disconcerting to our enemies, is clearly far superior than any other type of treatment existing in the state of our social scientific disciplines today. Fundamentally, it is a genetical analysis that empirically commences at the origin of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism and down to the present sturdily answers the fundamental question "How did this whole phenomenon of imperialist Red domination over peoples and nations come to be what it is?" From many angles, the merits of this total historical framework of reference are far-reaching and simply cannot be matched by any other mold of analysis, especially a shifting, pragmatic one that depends more on the ear than the brain. As our adversaries well know, this genetical type of analysis constantly puts forward the real evolution of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism so that there can never be any lapse in memory on the part of both the teacher and the taught, and room for exploitable dupes and the unwary is thereby severely restricted. The groundwork of the analysis also allows for a more penetrative analysis of current prob-

lems, the preclusion of hairbrained theories flouting evidence itself, the prudent minimization of repeated errors, a more flexible, rational adjustment to accidental changes in the Red environment, and certainly a more intuitive grasp of futural uncertainties. By the very nature of its content on expansive interrelationships, the analysis continually enforces a capacity to interrelate events effected by the strategic behavior of our prime enemy. Thus, for example, Moscow's build-up and imperial consolidation within, and "wars of liberation," can be more readily perceived and appreciated against the background of captive nations than on the basis of anything else.

To put it mildly, American global thinking is highly unstructured and floats largely on currents of development and change, and the immediate problems they pose. If it possesses background, it is in the nature of a mere succession of past developments and change, without a meaningful structure differentiating for the present and the future past essentials and unessentials. This also may seem as a harsh, critical indictment, but a bit of sober reflection on the relative decline of American power since 1945, its lost opportunities for expanded freedom had it possessed a global vision for the future grounded in the firm realities of the past, and its present state of national confusion and even absurdity cannot but lead one to serious doubts about its capability to exercise its world responsibility and insure an enduring peace. As the writer strongly points out in his current book, "In a way, we, the U.S., are like the infant child. On the scale of psycho-political warfare, 'peaceful co-engagement,' 'competitive coexistence' or whatever you wish to call it, in comparison with the Russian totalitarians we are grossly inferior in the critical areas of diplomatic maneuver, propaganda, ideological vision, totalistic thinking, long-run planning, espionage, political initiative, and sheer national will." Much of this is the result of our inability to shed quickly old preconceptions and myths that have founded our relations with the USSR, grounded our foreign policy for too long, and have ultimately been responsible for our present, unpredictable state.

THE SCOREBOARD

Over fifty years of Eurasian history are, with pointed essentiality for our national scorecard, along with probable projections for the period ahead: security, chronologized in this convenient

*The Captive Nations—Who's Next?*

Country, people, and year of Communist domination	
Armenia .....	1920
Azerbaijan .....	1920
Byelorussia .....	1920
Cosackia .....	1920
Georgia .....	1920
Idel-Ural .....	1920
North Caucasia .....	1920
Ukraine .....	1920
Far Eastern Republic .....	1922
Turkistan .....	1922
Mongolia .....	1924
Estonia .....	1940
Latvia .....	1940
Lithuania .....	1940
Albania .....	1946
Bulgaria .....	1946
Yugoslavia (Serbs, Croats, Slovenians, etc.) .....	1946
Poland .....	1947
Rumania .....	1947
Czecho-Slovakia .....	1948
North Korea .....	1948
Hungary .....	1949
East Germany .....	1949
Mainland China .....	1949
Tibet .....	1951
North Vietnam .....	1954
Cuba .....	1960

*Who's Next?*

South Vietnam? Algeria? Cambodia? Israel? Laos? Tanzania? Bolivia? Thailand? Egypt? Guatemala? Chile?

This scorecard is the summarical result of genetical analysis applied to the greatest, single reality in our world, the one billion captives under Red totalitarian captivity and, fundamentally, in terms of decisive power, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Myths and historically foolish utterances, expressed even on our highest official levels, about "Yugoslavian freedom," "Rumanian independence," "communist polycentrism," Armenians, Georgians, Ukrainians as being types of Russians, somewhat less than "the Great Russians," and the Red Chinese threat to Moscow in no way alter the structural framework conveyed in this scorecard. On the contrary, if present tendencies in the U.S. continue, the so-called leader of the Free World ironically will be contributing to further additions in this long list of captive nations, and the scorecard, which is firmly fixed objectively, will doubtlessly make deeper subjective imprints on those who have refused to face cumulative reality.

It may alarm most of us to know that, by virtue of our limitations and conceptual errors, we contributed heavily to the origin and development of this massive, captive nations reality. If one examines the scorecard, our contribution toward the captivity of all the nations under communist domination by 1924, was the ignorant unwillingness of our Government to secure the principle of national self-determination for all the non-Russian nations following the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire. No responsible mind can deny the crucial historical facts that our entrance into World War I was decisive, that we expressed the principle and possessed the power to enforce it, and had allies in France and Great Britain receptive to such action. What we lacked was appreciative knowledge and vision, and we helped an empire that increasingly threatens our national existence to be restored.

By the close of World War II our power was globally supreme, commanding the skies, harnessing the atom, and fielding the mightiest war machine in the world. But pathetically our diplomacy and leadership once again failed us, and like children escaping realities, for which present Vietnam is a microscopic parallel, we were hell-bent on demobilization. Back to the scorecard and you'll find that all of the nations listed from 1940 to 1951 could have been saved from their present captivity had we, again, the knowledge of whom we were dealing with and the vision to employ the power vested in us. Rank foolishness about Soviet Russian retaliation, free elections in the Central European countries, the Chinese agrarian revolution, to mention only a few, were the myopic rationalizations of the times. Had the far-seeing instincts of a Patton been given full support of expression, the waves of freedom would have even washed the Urals and beyond.

As for the remaining two captive nations on the scorecard, our incapacity to understand revolutionary warfare and its manipulations of nationalism and still more agrarian reform accounts more than our failure to apply our power early and decisively.

Aside from the period of the late 20's and the 30's, when Russia concentrated on building its industrial and war machines on the basis of its original captive resources, each decade registers cumulative additions to the captive nations list. For our decade of the 70's, yes, indeed, four decades of impressive experience cannot but influence one to ask "Who's Next?" Regardless of constantly shifting rifts in the Red Empire, one must objectively acknowledge the tremendous feat of conquest achieved by the Russian totalitarians, and at that with comparatively inferior resources. One can well imagine what

Footnotes at end of article.

the future holds should they attain to strategic nuclear superiority, primarily in their global psycho-political warfare.

The misinformation and misleading interpretations being dispensed by a variety of sources to the American public could contribute substantially to the extension of the captive nations list. Just to cite a few of abundant, current examples. One supposedly witty writer falls for the Russian technique of non-interference in the affairs of others, so long as they pursue their interferences, and admonishes us that "both by example and the judicious application of a little pressure, we can help in the work of the liberation of man."<sup>8</sup> It's evident that like others in this organ he has no conception of Soviet Russian strategy and tactics, nor is he reliable in treatment of facts. "Nothing is sadder," he writes, "than Captive Nation's Day, and nothing has been more despicable than politicians who've exploited the anguish behind it, by suggesting we could 'free' Poland or Estonia if we really wanted to. No single issue has given more impetus to the idea that there are secret Russian collaborationists in our government than this one." First, if anyone knows of any "Captive Nation's Day," he would be striking a factual revelation. And second, his two interpretations adequately measure the scope of his naivete, for no congressional supporter of the resolution ever exploited it in the way suggested and, even aside from the issue, practical political wisdom is enough to assume that we have our Hiss' today.

For the careful analyst it is hardly a surprise to see this drivil introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by none other than Senator Fulbright, one of the most illogical and misleading voices in our nation. This is said from direct, substantiating experience, and not just remote analysis. The Senator believes such "observations are worthy of the attention of the Senate."<sup>9</sup> In the same period, the Senator offered his interpretative gems in a lecture at Yale University: "It is assumed, *a priori*, that the natural and inevitable condition of the world is one of basic antagonism."<sup>10</sup> Mind you, *a priori*, as though no captive nations exist. Then, after speciously dubbing our experience with Nazi Germany, another imperialist power, as "atypical," thereby placing the Russians and the Red Chinese, also two imperialist powers, in a different light, the Senator dialecticizes in this fashion: "I do not contend that this assessment of Russian and Chinese ambitions is untrue, but only that it is not necessarily true. . ." Evidently, necessity for the Senator is only sensed when the roof caves in. Moreover, the documented record shows that the Senator's conception of the Soviet Union is identical with that recently expressed by another thinker of our day who, with reference to the U.S. and the USSR, ignorantly writes "Our two nations are still adversaries."<sup>11</sup> In short, it is this kind of current opinionating, divorced from essential facts and even nonsensical, that serves the fixed ambitions of our "adversaries" more than their own propaganda machines can accomplish in our direction.

#### THE INESCAPABLE REALITY OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

However much we seek to escape the imposing reality of the captive nations, this reality is inescapable. It is the foundation stone for the ambitions and global strategies of both Moscow and Peking, and at the same time the very existence of the captive nations is the source of our most serious national problems. A detailed, causal analysis through the captive nations approach can easily establish the sequential causation of problems from the captive nations base, Russian and Red Chinese aggressive threats, to our national security response, budgetary

allocations, inflation, cramped domestic priorities and so on down the proliferating line. There is nothing simplistic in this; with a captive nations background, the analysis emphasizes a cumulative causation of paramount problems that otherwise would not exist if the reality and its exploitable resources were not there. Parenthetically, this force of cumulative causation in historical time is a vital factor in the calculations of a Russian or Chinese global strategist since the seemingly endless proliferation of problems for his adversary is an advantage of great effect in itself. This is not to say that they do not have problems, both human and technical, but the former are efficiently managed through totalitarian means.

For our purposes here, the basic relevancy of the captive nations to several news-making subjects in the recent period can be shown to exemplify the formula on causation above as well as furnish additional insight into the broad generalizations advanced earlier. These subjects include Vietnam, the Kudirka case, political warfare on the U.S. terrain, and the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, with emphasis on the so-called nationalities problem. There are other subjects, but these will suffice. An essentialist treatment of each will also suffice.

#### (a) Vietnam and the captive nations

Certainly no war engulfing our involvement in this century has been as badly managed as the Vietnam war. The responsibility for its inordinate costs—900,000 lives, \$115 billion, 2.8 million disrupted young American lives, 53,771 U.S. deaths, 131,995 South Vietnamese military deaths, 703,280 North Vietnamese military deaths and so forth—does not rest with our straightjacketed military, but rather with our civilian leaders and behind them substantial segments of our electorate. The nature of the war was never fully understood, and until the end of the 60's our objectives in it were never lucidly explained to the people. The mess President Nixon inherited has been progressively dissipated, and we can come out of it honorably and successfully if responsible Americans can stubbornly resist the use of this vital issue as a political football in our domestic politics.

By the same token, this war has produced an inordinate amount of political absurdity and, from a global viewpoint, stupidity galore. Pseudo-moralistic harangues about it being "an immoral war" and the President's policy being "morally callous" because it shows "no concern for the sanctity of human life" reflect the political immaturity of their dispensers, not to say their twisted ethics.<sup>12</sup> To artificially isolate Vietnam from the global pattern of Red imperialist strategy, to ignore the direct and indirect aggression of proxy Hanoi, to view this merely as a "civil war," not to mention numerous other false views, actually measure the desperate need for captive nations education on the part of broad sections of our population. For the techniques and propaganda used by the enemy in Vietnam are old techniques repeated by the Soviet Russians as far back as 1917. Outside the vacuum of moralistic cliches and drenched in facts of the past as well as the present, our involvement in Vietnam has been not only necessary but also thoroughly moral.

From the broad captive nations viewpoint and background, Vietnam is only a new terrain for Soviet Russian and Red Chinese imperialism, the two chief supporters of Hanoi. With North Vietnam joining the family of captive nations, it was only a question of short time before Red aggression would force South Vietnam into the family, and then Laos and Cambodia and so forth domino-like. The much banded domino theory in discussions on Vietnam is no theory from the captive nations analytical viewpoint. It is clearly a cumulative, domino fact established for

fifty years. Thus, President Nixon in effect expressed the positive principle of national self-determination when he recently stated: "The issue very simply is this: Shall we leave Vietnam in a way that, by our own actions, consciously turns the country over to the Communists? Or shall we leave in a way that gives the South Vietnamese a reasonable chance to survive as a free people?"<sup>13</sup>

Conversely, the President could just as well have said "As so often in the past, are we prepared, especially now as a Free World leader, to permit the addition of another and unquestionably other nations to the long list of captive nations?" This is what it amounts to, and the consequences for us by such additions would be globally disastrous. Those with limited or irresponsible attitudes toward this crucial issue may ponder the next Vietnam should South Vietnam fall under the sprawling cover of the captive nations. They might also re-examine their moral consciences, as countless before have in the 40's and the 20's.

#### (b) The Kudirka case

Vibrant conscience expresses itself in many diverse ways, and one of the most important is ready access to political asylum. This has been a time-honored principle of our Republic and a prime reflector of the American conscience. An outrageous violation of this principle occurred in November 1971, when a Lithuanian sailor by the name of Simas Kudirka leaped to freedom from a Russian fishing trawler off Martha's Vineyard and was brutally returned by our Coast Guard. The disclosures in this case will indicate the lapse of conscience and political ineptitude described earlier, in this case a sample of the authorities involved.

It is unnecessary here to dwell on the eye-opening details of the case, for the published hearings are available to the public. From the politico-moral viewpoint, suffice it to say that, traditionally, the extension of political asylum under whatever circumstances, on land, sea or in the air, has been automatic. One of the conclusions arrived at by a congressional body with reference to an involved officer clearly shows the moral aspect of this scandalous case: "In other words, he was saying: 'I've got it made. What do I care for any other human being.' If this attitude is typical of high officials in the Coast Guard, God help America."<sup>14</sup>

But the additional fact is that this human being was defecting from Russian domination of his captive land, Lithuania. A politico-moral sensitivity to this circumstance could only be derived from proper training in terms of the captive nations approach. The testimony reveals how gravely derelict we are in this important respect. Consider this from a Coast Guard officer: "I didn't and I still don't feel there is any facts that the Russians go around killing people." This quote is accurate, but the committee did also conclude, "A reading of the many communications on the Kudirka case points up the need not only for aggressive action but for a refresher course in basic English for both Coast Guard and State Department officers."<sup>15</sup> However, aside from the English, it would probably flabbergast the officer to learn that over the past fifty years some 80 million lives have been sacrificed by the Russian totalitarians. The answers given by Admiral Ellis to Representative Derwinski's questions concerning education on the Soviet Union and Russian contempt for international law are enough to indicate the low state of our training.<sup>16</sup>

#### (c) Political warfare on the U.S. terrain

A careful documentation of this subject would have to cover enemy subversive preparations as far back as 1961, that is for overt operations in the form of bombings, propaganda, demonstrations and assassinations. Those of us who as far back as 1952 advocated the creation of a Freedom Acade-

Footnotes at end of article.

my for the study of Red political warfare can take pride in our vision of things to come. Some senatorial reactions to the bombing of the Senate in March 1971—such as "You wonder what motivates people to do a thing like this" or "The massive bombardment we are continuing year after year against the people of Indochina has its counterpart in the mounting destruction of humane values in our own land"—actually underscore the desperate need of this Academy, even for some naive Senators.

The relation of this dimension to the captive nations lies in the fact that the Russians, through proxy procedure, have established and are supporting training centers in these nations for this operation. For years Moscow has maintained simulated American towns in Ukraine for such training. Cuba has over forty such centers to receive young American renegades under cover of cutting sugar canes. The ouster of four Russian diplomats from Mexico in March, 1971, involved the training of Mexican traitors in North Korea. One would have to be blind, indeed, not to see Hanoi's long arm of supporters in most of the anti-war demonstrations here. In short, it is not just Communist Party participation in this operation to achieve defeat for the U.S. in Vietnam; the preparatory and supporting sources are in Havana, Hanoi, Prague, Pyongyang and other proxy centers of captive lands.

(d) *The 24th CPSU and the captive non-Russian nations in USSR*

While captive resources are increasingly exploited for the training of traitors in political warfare management in the U.S. and elsewhere, patriots and freedom-fighters in the captive nations seek ways and means to express their nation's desire for freedom and hope for eventual liberation. It should be emphasized that our traitors receive substantial support from our enemies, the patriots in and from the captive nations have not enjoyed equivalent assistance. Nonetheless, in the recent period, the Russian rape of Czechoslovakia, the outbreaks in Poland, the arrests of intellectuals in Ukraine, the inter-republic frictions in Yugoslavia, and the mutual charges of imperialism and colonialism in Moscow and Peking also reflect the basic and imposing reality of the captive nations within the Red Empire itself. The cardinal objective of Moscow and its syndicate members has been and will continue to be the acquisition of Free World agreement to the permanent captivity of their dominated peoples, but the captive nations themselves will from time to time impress themselves on Free World attention, if not on its prudent and insurable aid.

Thus, as concern the pressure of invincible nationalism and the captive non-Russian nations in the USSR, the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, held in March-April of 1971, served up additional examples of the far-reaching ramifications and impact of the captive nations. The demands on the part of the Japanese, Belgian, Chilean and other delegations to the Congress for "independence of each party and noninterference in one another's affairs" may be viewed by some as expressions of nationalism, but there is little reason to count on them. Each of these parties would be for naught in their respective countries if there were no powerful Soviet Union. The same applies to the CP's in the Red Empire, as in Yugoslavia, Rumania, Poland, Ukraine and so forth.

What by far was more important was the string of slavish obsequies uttered by leaders of the non-Russian CP's in the USSR. Listen first to Brezhnev: "All the nations and nationalities of our country, above all the great Russian people, played their role in the formation, consolidation and development of this mighty union of equal nations that have taken the road to socialism." No sooner was this myth propounded that the

so-called Ukrainian quickly added, "The revolutionary energy, dedication, diligence and profound internationalism of the Russian people have quite legitimately won them the sincere respect of all the other peoples of our Socialist motherland." Plainly, isn't Russian domination a paradise of priceless blessings? The Armenian Kochinyan put in his bit of praise for "the role of the culture of the Great Russian people." The Azerbaijani Aliyev piped in "the friendship and mutual assistance of Soviet peoples, headed by our elder brother, the great Russian people"; and the Turkestanian Rashidov ranted about "the great striving of people of all nationalities to learn the Russian language . . ." as . . . "convincing evidence of the dedication of Soviet peoples to this union, of their love and respect for their elder brother." Oh!, so sweet this Russification!

Underlying each of these spurious utterances is, of course, the fear of rampant nationalism in the USSR, which justifies the Amalrik question "Will the Soviet Union Survive by 1984?" The Latvian Voss brought this into focus with his euphemisms about "Our whole Socialist reality brings up the people in the spirit of friendship and fraternity of the peoples of the U.S.S.R. . . . The Latvian rabble, already thrown on the dustbin of history, maliciously libel the friendship and unity of the Soviet people. They spread untruthful statements that suppression of national minorities exist in the U.S.S.R. . . . Only isolated, politically immature people fall for the bait of such nationalistic fables." Need more be said about the towering reality of the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself?

A NEW FOREIGN POLICY? PINGING RATHER THAN PONGING

The scope, ramifications, theoretic structural unity, and fundamentalism of captive nations reality and mode of analysis should be perfectly clear by now. In present-day, confused America, these aspects and features deserve wide circulation for sober thought and action. The forum provided by Captive Nations Week in the third week of July (the 1971 Week being July 18-24) should generate such constructive discussion. The President can lead in this with a more forceful proclamation. The Congress can pave new paths by creating a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations. And our foreign policy toward the Soviet Union can be realistically reshaped to deal effectively with Moscow. Even the ping-pong diplomacy of the present, engendering evolving American-Red Chinese contacts and relations, necessitates careful consideration of the captive nations in the Red Chinese imperial complex.<sup>1</sup>

Upon the issuance of the 617 page State Department report on the State of the World, Secretary of State Rogers declared, "My great hope is that the path we are taking can help create among Americans a new national unity and purpose in our foreign policy—a policy no longer haunted by the past, but committed freshly to the opportunities of the future." One cannot but strongly share this hope, and at the same time point to the captive nations approach as its best means of realization. The President's doubt about us ever having another war won't be justified without this approach. To secure peace with freedom means to ping rather than just pong. Opportunities for pinging are great with the captive nations.

FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> See Lev E. Dobriansky, *The Vulnerable Russians*, New York, 1967, pp. 454.

<sup>2</sup> *Forward-Looking Addresses . . . on the Captive Nations Week Movement*, USGPO, Washington, 1969, pp. 105.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., "The Reality of the Captive Nations . . ." CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 32, pps. 43409-43427.

<sup>4</sup> A. Borisov, "U.S. Anti-Communism," *International Affairs*, Moscow, November 1970.

<sup>5</sup> CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 32, p. 43400.

<sup>6</sup> Lev E. Dobriansky, *U.S.A. and the Soviet Myth*, The Devin-Adair Company, Old Greenwich, Conn., 1971, p. 206.

<sup>7</sup> See for similar projections *Captive Nations Week; Red Nightmare, Freedom's Hope*, USGPO, Washington, D.C., 1966, p. 173.

<sup>8</sup> Nicholas von Hoffman, "America as Liberator of Man: Whom Do you Choose?" *The Washington Post*, Apr. 2, 1971.

<sup>9</sup> "America as Liberator of Man," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 5, 1971, p. 9643.

<sup>10</sup> Senator J. W. Fulbright, "A New Internationalism," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 14, 1971, p. 10357.

<sup>11</sup> Theodore Sorensen, "Russians Show an Increasing Interest in What Goes on Here," *The Sunday Star*, Washington, D.C., Apr. 4, 1971.

<sup>12</sup> E.g. Kingman Brewster, Jr., address, Yale University Alumni, New Haven, Conn., Feb. 20, 1971.

<sup>13</sup> "Nixon: Involvement in This War Is Coming to an End," *The Washington Post*, Apr. 8, 1971.

<sup>14</sup> Attempted Defection by Lithuanian Seaman Simas Kudrka," report, Committee on Foreign Affairs, Feb. 4, 1971, p. 91.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 10.

<sup>16</sup> Hearings, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 1971, p. 185.

<sup>17</sup> See "Plans of Militant Antiwar Groups To Launch Massive Demonstration," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 6, 1971, p. 9787.

<sup>18</sup> See "The Geographical Expression of Mainland China," CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 116, pt. 32, pps. 43442-49.

TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

The first Shriners Hospital for Crippled Children was opened in 1922. As the need increased, more units were added until there are today 19 orthopedic units and three burns institutes in which more than 150,000 children have been hospitalized without charge.

"LEST WE FORGET"

(Mr. MILLER of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in a land of progress and prosperity, it is often easy to assume an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,550 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children, and parents of these men have not forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved.

Maj. Wilfred K. Abbott, U.S. Air Force, XXXXXXXXXX San Diego, Calif. Married and the father of two children. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Abbott, Afton, Wyo. A 1956 graduate of Pasadena City College. Officially listed as missing

September 5, 1966. Since, officially listed as confirmed prisoner August 9, 1969. As of today, Major Abbott has been missing or held prisoner in Southeast Asia for 1,701 days.

#### SCHOOLS IN HEALTH PROFESSIONS ARE IN HARD TIMES

(Mr. GIAIMO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, at a well-attended press conference this morning a coalition of major health training organizations presented their alternative to the administration budget for the National Institutes of Health and the Health Services and Mental Health Administration.

While I have not examined all parts of this alternative budget in detail, and cannot therefore endorse the proposals in their entirety, I would like to offer observations concerning the priority that health training, research, and services have received in administration thinking, and encourage my colleagues both on the Appropriations Committee and throughout Congress to similarly consider the arguments of this coalition.

The fact is that through a variety of circumstances, some of them inadvertently fostered by past Federal actions, schools in the health professions, and particularly schools of medicine, are in the midst of extremely hard times.

Hard times for all schools of health professions, in turn, mean both short-range problems for the Nation's medical care needs and long-range problems in training the next generation of physicians, nurses, pharmacists, and other health professionals, performing the medical research which is, in the end, the most economical use of public funds, and providing for the still further inflated demands for service that are sure to result from whichever form of national health insurance, service or tax credit is adopted by the Congress.

Hard times in health, moreover, illustrate that convenient economies in complex fields, particularly those encompassing research, training and service, lead to unmet goals, decreased effectiveness and "catch-up" programs in place of innovation.

And no economy in health, in turn, is so false as those achieved at the expense of research and manpower development.

Research, as those of us know who deal with appropriations in other technical areas, is a long-range investment which is, however, the most economical use of public funds, since the end result saves unnecessary labor, saves on cumbersome, expensive and symptom-oriented alternatives, and, in medicine, can prevent illness and save lives. Moreover, researchers supported through Federal funds help create new and meaningful jobs in the application of those research findings.

Ironically, however, the onslaught of cutbacks in medical research funds have undermined the fiscal base of every medical school in this country. Such cuts, in 1966-67 and every year since, relative

to inflation's rise, were probably initially to the good, forcing internal reassessment of priorities in some fields of medical research. That particular pendulum has gone too far, however, and threatens to cut off the fruits of a generation of medical research as well as the base for the next generation's research.

Research, in addition, is intimately tied to the manpower capability of American schools of health professions, since research cuts have not been compensated for by increased education, training or service support for health professions schools. More than half of the Nation's medical schools, in fact, were recipients this year of special project or emergency-type grants, enabling them to limp along, but small compensation for major discomfort in times of increased need.

Manpower, therefore, can be seen as a resource in health which can be developed only when the schools can afford the students, and when the students can afford the schools.

The first condition—the ability of health professions schools to operate effectively, and to carry out the research and training so obviously needed in medicine—can be satisfied by adequate research support from the National Institutes of Health, by assistance in the construction and operation of schools in different health fields, and by allowing the kind of elbow room which is necessary to find better ways to develop and distribute medical care.

The second condition—the ability of the most qualified of students to attend expensive health professions schools—is also dependent on wise congressional action in both authorization and appropriation activity.

Although the Health Professions Education Assistance Act expires this year, quick action by the honorable gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and his colleagues will hopefully avoid a situation in which every incoming first year medical student will be financially stranded, without either Federal loan or scholarship support. Extension of this act will be only a necessary prelude, however, to examination of the full spectrum of congressional health training mandates, with the goal of rationalizing the process of student support, combining that support with adequate capitation payment to schools of the health professions, and avoiding the kind of cliff-hanging deadlines which inhibit planning.

In summary, the time has come for all Members of Congress to reflect what they perceive to be the health manpower and medical research needs of the Nation, particularly when examples from their districts and States are clearcut and call for action.

In Connecticut, for example, both the new University of Connecticut School of Medicine and the Yale University School of Medicine have made significant attempts to increase the size of their medical classes, without compromising the quality or altering the kind of student produced. Both, however, have been hard pressed to innovate in times of the Federal fiscal scramble, when even Congress has shown reticence in meeting the

one great, universally acknowledged manpower shortage in the Nation, that of health manpower.

I would encourage the honorable members of that subcommittee considering the budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to consider the presentation and arguments of this unique coalition of medical, osteopathic, dental, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, veterinary, and other health professional schools.

As a cooperative effort of fundamentally different groups, this coalition cannot be considered a special interest group in the usual sense, except that they hold the health of the Nation, the training of all health professionals, and the performance of medical research as their special interest.

I am not, of course, advocating an indiscriminate "shopping bag" approach to health appropriations, and I do recognize from hard experience the many demands placed on the public dollar. Nevertheless, the size, prestige, laudable intentions and commonsense of this coalition warrant the particular consideration of all Members of Congress, and especially those Members most familiar with funding problems addressed by this coalition.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RONCALIO, for 60 minutes on Monday, May 17.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POWELL) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAY, for 10 minutes, on May 5.

Mr. ROBISON of New York, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MIZELL, for 3 minutes, today.

Mr. BUCHANAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BADELLO) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, for 10 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER, immediately prior to the vote on H.R. 7500 on the Private Calendar today.

Mr. BROOKS, immediately following Mr. FISHER during consideration of H.R. 7500 on the Private Calendar today.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. BETTS, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DE LA GARZA to extend his remarks in the Extensions of Remarks.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POWELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KUYKENDALL.  
Mr. HORTON.  
Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.  
Mr. GUDE.  
Mr. DERWINSKI.  
Mr. KEMP in four instances.  
Mr. SPENCE.  
Mr. SCHERLE.  
Mr. FISH.  
Mr. ROUSSELOT.  
Mr. BROTZMAN.  
Mr. OKONSKI.  
Mr. HALPERN in five instances.  
Mr. BROWN of Ohio.  
Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin.  
Mr. VEYSEY.  
Mr. TERRY.  
Mr. ZWACH.  
Mr. SCHMITZ.  
Mr. WYLIE.  
Mr. CLANCY.  
Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
Mr. QUILLEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BADILLO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DE LA GARZA in 10 instances.  
Mrs. GRASSO in six instances.  
Mr. O'HARA in two instances.  
Mr. McFALL in six instances.  
Mr. MURPHY of New York.  
Mr. HAMILTON.  
Mr. STUCKEY.  
Mr. HARRINGTON in three instances.  
Mr. BEGICH in three instances.  
Mr. EILBERG in two instances.  
Mr. FAUNTROY in three instances.  
Mr. REES.  
Mr. SARBANES in five instances.  
Mr. HATHAWAY.  
Mr. FOLEY in three instances.  
Mr. UDALL in 10 instances.  
Mr. ZABLOCKI in two instances.  
Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.  
Mr. HAGAN in three instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KYROS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BEVILL.  
Mr. WRIGHT in two instances.  
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.  
Mr. O'NEILL in three instances.  
Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.  
Mr. CONYERS in five instances.  
Mr. HOWARD in two instances.

#### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 166. An act to designate the Stratified Primitive Area as a part of the Washakie Wilderness, heretofore known as the South Absaroka Wilderness, Shoshone National Forest, in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow,

Wednesday, May 5, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBER

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 92d Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the 80th Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U.S.C. title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

MENDEL J. DAVIS, First District of South Carolina.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

667. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend and extend for a temporary period the act of November 9, 1966, permitting persons from countries friendly to the United States to receive instruction at the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

668. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the National Capital Region Water and Waste Management Report, pursuant to section 704 of Public Law 91-650; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

669. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed contract with the University of San Francisco for a research project relative to the development of a personnel dosimeter for uranium miners, pursuant to Public Law 89-672; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

670. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

671. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the order suspending deportation in the case numbered All 977 348, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

672. A letter from the Administrator, Vet-

erans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide improved medical care to veterans; to improve recruitment and retention of career personnel in the Department of Medicine and Surgery; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 240. Resolution to refer the bill, H.R. 4473, entitled "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims in accordance with sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 401. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 6204) entitled "A bill for the relief of John S. Attinello" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended. (Rept. No. 92-172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2035. A bill for the relief of William R. Karsteter; with amendments (Rept. No. 92-173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2110. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julius L. Goepfinger; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DANIELSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6998. A bill for the relief of Salman M. Hilmy (Rept. No. 92-175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 3613. A bill to provide during times of high unemployment for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons, to assist States and local communities in providing needed public services, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6638. A bill to amend the act of August 9, 1955, relating to school fare subsidy for transportation of schoolchildren within the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 92-177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7931. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code with respect to the administration of small estates, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. for the Commission on Civil Rights (Rept. No. 92-179). Referred to the Committee of H.R. 7271. A bill to authorize appropriations the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 8027. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that members

of the Armed Forces be assigned to duty stations near their homes after serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRINKLEY (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. ROBISON of New York, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. MANN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CLARK, and Mr. SCHMITZ):

H.R. 8028. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRINKLEY (for himself, Mr. MATHIS of Georgia, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. KYROS, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RARICK, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. WARE, Mr. HUNT, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. WINN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. KING, Mr. LENNON and Mr. DANIEL of Virginia):

H.R. 8029. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Wives of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY:  
H.R. 8030. A bill to restore the investment tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLIER:  
H.R. 8031. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exclude from the mails as a special category of nonmailable matter certain material offered for sale to minors, to improve the protection of the right of privacy by defining obscene mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 8032. A bill to provide increased unemployment compensation benefits for Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself and Mr. ROUSH):

H.R. 8033. A bill to designate the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr., as a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTER:  
H.R. 8034. A bill to amend the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 to permit Federal sharing of the cost of unemployment benefits which extend for 52 weeks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE (by request):  
H.R. 8035. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to establish a NATO Defense Medal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:  
H.R. 8036. A bill to limit and control expenditures made by or on behalf of candidates for election to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FASCELL:  
H.R. 8037. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize a legal services program by establishing a National Legal Services Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DOWNING, Mr. GUDE, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. POFF, Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEELE, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. WAMPLER, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.R. 8038. A bill to further amend the act

of October 4, 1961, amended by the act of July 19, 1966, to facilitate the efficient preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRINGTON (for himself, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania and Mr. NIX):

H.R. 8039. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the ocean, coastal, and other waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HASTINGS:  
H.R. 8040. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:  
H.R. 8041. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to protect, manage, and control free-roaming horses and burros on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 8042. A bill to amend title 38 to provide that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be considered active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 8043. A bill to prevent a decrease in the dependency and indemnity compensation of any dependent parent of a deceased veteran or in the pension of any veterans or widow of a veteran as the result of the increase in social security benefits provided by Public Law 92-5 or by any increase in railroad retirement benefits during the calendar year 1971; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:  
H.R. 8044. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code, to provide maternity care in service facilities for certain members of the uniformed services and their dependents after such members are separated from active duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 8045. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for the control of pollution in the Boston Harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8046. A bill to provide for the control of pollution in the Boston Harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 8047. A bill to provide increased unemployment compensation benefits for Vietnam era veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8048. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$1,000 in all cases the amount of the lump-sum death payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 8049. A bill to provide a program in the Department of Agriculture under which the Federal Government, in partnership with the government of the States, will assist in the provision of adequate housing for migratory agricultural workers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KARTH:  
H.R. 8050. A bill to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to provide for class actions in the U.S. district courts against persons responsible for creating certain environmental hazards; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr.

BURTON, Mr. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. ROY):

H.R. 8051. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend for 5 years (until June 30, 1977) the period within which certain special project grants may be made thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCFALL (for himself and Mr. SISK):

H.R. 8052. A bill to amend the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MINSHALL:  
H.R. 8053. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Acts of 1970 to further clarify the intent of Congress as to priorities for airway modernization and airport development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8054. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by adding a new section to prohibit sales below cost for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZELL (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ABBETT, Mr. McMILLAN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, and Mr. WAMPLER):

H.R. 8055. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, relating to the lease and transfer of tobacco acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. QUIE:  
H.R. 8056. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and title II of the Social Security Act to provide a full exemption (through credit or refund) from the employees' tax under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act, and an equivalent reduction in the self-employment tax, in the case of individuals who have attained age 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:  
H.R. 8057. A bill to enlarge Sequoia National Park in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:  
H.R. 8058. A bill to amend the Airport and Airway Development and Revenue Acts of 1970 to further clarify the intent of Congress as to priorities for airway modernization and airport development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUSH (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BURTON, Mr. DOW, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FULTON of Tennessee, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GRAY, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ROSENTHAL, and Mrs. SULLIVAN):

H.R. 8059. A bill to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the purpose of developing and improving communication procedures and facilities with respect to the prompt and efficient dispatch of police, fire, rescue, and other emergency services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDMAN (for himself, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. BURLISON of Missouri, Mr. ADDABO, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LLOYD, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. CORDOVA, Mr. RAILSBACK, and Mr. FLOWERS):

H.R. 8060. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SANDMAN (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. LENNON, Mr. SHOUP, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. WAGGONNER, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. ARENDS, and Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON):

H.R. 8061. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 so as to provide for the regulation of the broadcasting of certain major sporting events in the public interest; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. McCCLURE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. McKEVITT, and Mr. CORDOVA):

H.R. 8062. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior the position of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. McCCLURE, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 8063. A bill to provide for financing the economic development of Indians and Indian organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. TERRY):

H.R. 8064. A bill to amend certain laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 8065. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to revise the eligibility conditions for annuities, to change the railroad retirement tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 8066. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to

insure the procurement and use by the Federal Government of products manufactured from recycled materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 8067. A bill to bring the tax reductions for individuals provided by the Tax Reform Act of 1969 into immediate effect; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the entire amount of the compensation of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who are prisoners of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.J. Res. 606. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the busing or involuntary assignment of students; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY of Texas:

H.J. Res. 607. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to insure the right of parents and local school authorities to determine which school the children in that locality will attend; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution to authorize the interment of an unknown soldier from Vietnam in the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BURTON,

Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOSS, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. SISK, Mr. VAN DEERLIN, Mr. WALDIE, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution to instruct the President of the United States to release

certain appropriated funds; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 289. Concurrent resolution relative to citizens radio service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent resolution relative to asset depreciation range; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 421. Resolution urging that import controls be placed on men's wearing apparel, textile goods, and shoes manufactured in foreign countries employing cheap labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 8069. A bill for the relief of Joyce Ann Farrior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 8070. A bill for the relief of Angelo Battista Noll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 8071. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cipoletta and his wife, Rita Cipoletta, and their children, Gaetano Cipoletta, Patrizia Cipoletta, Sabrina Cipoletta, and Antonia Cipoletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.R. 8072. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eva Odisho, John K. Otis, William C. Otis, and Joseph J. Otis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

70. The SPEAKER presented petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to the exchange of prisoners of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DR. GEORGE L. "SHORTY" COLLINS RECEIVES EDWIN T. DAHLBERG PEACE AWARD

### HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to advise my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate that Dr. George L. "Shorty" Collins, Baptist College chaplain at Grace Baptist Church in San Jose, Calif., will on May 13, 1971, be awarded the Edwin T. Dahlberg Peace Award at ceremonies to be held at this year's American Baptist Convention being held in Minneapolis, Minn.

I am particularly pleased that "Shorty" Collins is receiving this high honor, because he has been a personal friend and associate of mine for many years. His humanity and leadership have been an inspiration to all of us who have been working for peace and justice in California and elsewhere.

The peace award statement to be presented to Dr. Collins reads as follows:

For the testimony of his life as a persistent, gentle, courageous advocate of peace and justice; for his quiet, personal influence which has led students, faculty, friends and co-workers to dedicate their lives to the cause of peace; for the spirit of reconciliation which permeates his life and builds bridges of respect and affection even to those who oppose him, the American Baptist Convention awards to Dr. George L. Collins the Edwin T. Dahlberg Peace Award, May 13, 1971.

The name of George L. "Shorty" Collins is synonymous with reconciliation. His witness is quiet, persistent, and enduring. He has a personal manner that embraces both gentleness and great courage. He is a loyal disciple of Christ, a prophet in the truest sense of the word, a constant witness to the reconciling power of the gospel.

Both in his vocation as a campus pastor and in his service with the Fellowship of Reconciliation, he has worked for international, racial, and community peace, and economic justice. In the face of critical opposition he has stood for the principles which make for human

well-being within the family of nations, within the State, and within the community. He has singlemindedly kept before himself and his coworkers the evils of war and militarism. He has given sledge hammer blows at cited injustices in American society while at the same time in a most creative way, he has employed his keen wit and his human kindness both to empower the blows and to disarm the agents of the injustices.

"Shorty" Collins is a most gentle and persistent advocate of peace. Even in the tension which inevitably swirls about his advocacy he is a walking testimony that man can know peace in the midst of strife. He has refused to hate those who disagree with his political and economic convictions and is loved by almost all who know him.

Probably his greatest contribution has been the personal influence he has had on faculty, friends, and coworkers which has led many of them to recognize and accept their individual responsibility to work for peace. Some of those who have taken light from Shorty's torch are working in the Mekong Delta project, some in the State Department, others in